FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-224
Friday
20 November 1987

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-224

CONTENTS

20 November 1987

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CPSU's Medvedev Meets Bloc Envoys *[PRAVDA 19 Nov]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

UN Begins International Security Discussion 2
  Petrovskiy Addresses Committee 2
UNESCO's Various Roles, Functions Viewed *[V. Koptilov in PRAVDA 14 Nov]* 2

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze Receives Ambassador Matlock 5
Shultz, Shevardnadze To Meet 23-24 Nov 5
Officials Visit U.S. Chemical Weapons Plant 5
Yakubov on Iran-Contras Affair, Reagan Role 5
House Votes To Limit Stinger Deliveries 6
Senate Endorses 1988 Military Budget 6
Pravdin Notes Bering Sea Military Maneuvers 6
'Capital to Capital' Telebridge Program 7

China

CPC Aide on SDI, Taiwan, Japan Trade *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 19 Nov]* 18

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Delegation Leaves for New Zealand, Australia *[IZVESTIYA 17 Nov]* 19
  Meets Australia's Hayden 19
  Received by Hawke 19
New Ambassador to Philippines Appointed 20
USSR, Vietnam Sign 1988 Trade Protocol 20
USSR, Cambodia Sign 1988 Trade Agreement 20

Near East & South Asia

Ryzhkov Departs 19 Nov for Visit to India *[IZVESTIYA 20 Nov]* 20
  Stops in Tashkent En Route 20
  Arrives in New Delhi 20 Nov 20
Dobrynin Sees Indian Communications Minister *[PRAVDA 19 Nov]* 21
Pyadyshev on Gulf Situation, Arms to Tehran *[KUNA]* 21
Anishchev Led Delegation Returns From Beirut *[PRAVDA 19 Nov]* 21
Amman Summit One of Reconciliation, Accord *[Amman AL-RA'Y 19 Nov]* 21

East Europe

Gorbachev, Strougal Discuss Economic Reform *[Bratislava PRAVDA 17 Nov]* 22
Vorotnikov Interview on Direct Relations *[Bratislava PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 23
Envoy to GDR Meets With W. Berlin Mayor 24
GDR Official on Progress of Amnesty *[IZVESTIYA 16 Nov]* 24

MSZMP Central Committee Plenum Meets [*PRAVDA 14 Nov*] 24
Hungarian Party Officials Visit 16-19 Nov 24
BCP Plenum on Decision Implementation [*SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 15 Nov*] 25

West Europe

Gorbachev Sends Condolences on UK Subway Fire 25
Aganbegyan Speaks at British News Conference 25
Kamentsev Meets Danish Premier, Officials [*IZVESTIYA 14 Nov*] 26
Portuguese President Soares Interviewed [*IZVESTIYA 19 Nov*] 26
France Tests Nuclear Device at Mururoa Atoll 27
FRG 'Revanchist' Organization Described 27
Economic Ties With Turkey, Prospects Viewed [*PRAVDA 16 Nov*] 28

Latin America & Caribbean

Panama's Suarez Says U.S. 'To Murder' Noriega 29
Soviet Parliamentarians Begin Mexico Visit [*IZVESTIYA 20 Nov*] 29
RSFSR Presidium Chairman Orlov Visits Cuba [*IZVESTIYA 20 Nov*] 30
U.S. 'Blocking Efforts' at Central American Peace [*Staroselskiy*] 30

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Politburo Discusses Employment, Health Care 31
CPSU Holds Seminar for Propagandists [*PRAVDA 19 Nov*] 31
Batalin Gives Out Construction Awards 31
Zaykov Attends Manufacturing Conference 32
Leaders Sign Obituary of Malyy Theater Director [*PRAVDA 11 Nov*] 32
MOSCOW NEWS On GOSR Press Center Activities [*V. Aleksandrov, No 46*] 32
Meeting of Foreign Party Delegations [*ZA RUBEZHOM No 46*] 33
Former Hijacker Murzhenko Gets Exit Visa [*AFP*] 34
Press Briefed on Latvian Demonstrations 35
  Anti-Soviet Action Denied 35
  Criticizes Resolution 35
  No Violence Reported [*AFP*] 36
  'Thousands' March [*Stockholm*] 36
  DIE WELT On Demonstrations [*Bonn, 20 Nov*] 36
  Exiles Report Demonstrations [*DPA*] 37
Philby Appears in Interview on Latvian TV 37
Youth Daily Ponders Nationalism in Estonia [*KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Nov*] 38
Inter-Nation Relations Departments Urged [*SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 12 Nov*] 40
Bagirov Addresses Azerbaijan Party Meeting [*Baku*] 41
Regional Officials on Perestroyka Problems 41
Patiashvili on Nationalities, Chauvinism 42
Turkmenia Changes Narcotics Legislation 42
Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Session 13 Nov [*RADYANSKA UKRANIA 14 Nov*] 43
Ukrainian Committee Approves Plan, Budget [*PRAVDA UKRAINY 13 Nov*] 44
Kazakh Presidium Replaces Education Minister [*Alma-Ata*] 45
Editor Describes Jewish Life in USSR 45
Reader Complains on Dearth of DRA Reportage [*PRAVDA 16 Nov*] 45
Psychiatric Hospital Abuses Described [*KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Nov*] 45
OGONEK Editor Korotich Interviewed [*Sofia LITERATUREN FRONT 5 Nov*] 51
PRAVDA Apologizes for False Accusations [*14 Nov*] 52
Sakharov Comments Barshchevskiy Film 'Risk' [*MOSCOW NEWS No 45*] 52
Vysotskiy's Father Protests Distortions [*SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 12 Nov*] 54
Writer Welcomes Passing of 'Usual Unanimity' [*A. Druzenko in MOSCOW NEWS No 46*] 54
Legal Status of Ukrainian Language Discussed [*RADYANSKA UKRAINA 31 Oct*] 55
Yevtushenko on Restructuring, Resistance [*SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 7 Nov*] 58
Writer Recalls 'Manufacture' of Brezhnev Image [*MOSCOW NEWS No 45*] 60

Perestroyka: Remembering 'Difficult Past' *[MOSCOW NEWS No 46]* 60
Need for Historical Awareness Argued *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 10 Nov]* 61
Afanasyev on Historiography Controversy *[Copenhagen DET FRI AKTUELT 8 Nov]* 64
Seminar on CPSU History Opens 17 Nov *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 65
Response to Restructuring 'Positive' 65
Book on 'Soviet Society Today' Published *[PRAVDA 19 Nov]* 65
Markov Comments on State Prize Awards *[TRUD 8 Nov]* 66
PRAVDA Notes Contents of Latest KOMMUNIST *[19 Nov]* 67
Correction to Marchais Moscow Forum Address 67

Agricultural

CPSU Central Committee on Agro-Industry *[PRAVDA 19 Nov]* 67

Military

More on Strategic Rocket Forces, Artillery Day 81
  Yazov on 'Danger' of Nuclear War *[TANJUG]* 81
  General Maksimov Address 81
  Rodin on Combat Readiness 83
  Jubilee of Missile Launch Noted *[Tikhomirov]* 83

UN Begins International Security Discussion
LD200031 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1727 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] New York, 19 Nov (TASS) Today, the First Committee of the 42d session of the UN General Assembly started discussion of one of the most important questions on its agenda: The creation of a comprehensive system of international security. The idea of comprehensive security put forward for the consideration of the United Nations by a group of socialist countries, is permeated with a striving to support and consolidate the process of the positive development of international relations on a multilateral basis, stated Vladimir Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister. The main idea of is the finding by collective efforts of a balance of interests of states and of an optimal correlation of national interests with those of mankind as a whole. We invite others to jointly seek ways for mankind to cross the minefield of our times to the 21st century, a nuclear-free and nonviolent world, the Soviet representative stressed.

Petrovskiy Addresses Committee
LD200918 Moscow TASS in English 0847 GMT 20 Nov 87

[Text] New York November 20 TASS—The First Committee of the 42nd U.N. General Assembly session started on Thursday discussing one of the major items on its agenda—the socialist countries' joint initiative for establishing a comprehensive system of international security.

The participants in the discussion stress the need of concentrating the attention on the joint quest for ways of democratic reconstruction of all areas of international relations to overcome confrontation and come over to broader cooperation in solving global problems, eliminating the threat of nuclear self-destruction.

The purport of the idea of comprehensive international security is to find through joint efforts the balance of the interests of the states and the optimum correlation of the national interests with the interests common to the whole of mankind, said Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy foreign minister of the USSR. The Socialist countries propose that all the states should jointly look for ways of building up security for all, mobilise the collective reason of the international community with a view of finding realistic and generally acceptable solutions of international problems.

The present-day realities objectively heighten the need for a many-sided approach to questions of international peace and security. The Soviet Union holds that the U.N. Charter is the model of ensuring the security of the international community, considering the national interests of all states. The task, as we see it, is to make this model efficient and reliably guaranteed in new, nuclear-space conditions. It is essential to enhance the efficiency of the United Nations in all areas of its activities for it to become in deed the centre of concerted actions in maintaining international peace and security. Our approaches to intensification of the multilateral process, to internationalisation of efforts of ensuring security were set forth in a concentrated form in Mikhail Gorbachev's article "The Reality and Guarantees of a Secure World" which actually presents a broad and all-embracing initial project of a possible new set-up of life in our common planetary home in accordance with the U.N. Ideals, on the basis of the U.N. Charter, said the Soviet representative. Such a set-up which will make the security of all the earnest of security of everyone.

We believe that the concept of comprehensive security, just as any thinking, should materialise itself in the purposeful political conduct, in acts of reasonable will, in practical deeds, said the USSR representative. The creation of a ramified infrastructure of confidence and openness in the relations between states is the kernel of comprehensive security. It is now required to come over from confidence-building measures in separate areas to broad-scale confidence-building policy, embracing all areas of contemporary international relations. Openness and democratism in internal life and external political activities of states, mechanisms of elaboration and adoption of major decisions, particularly in the military-political sphere, are a very important condition and means of ensuring confidence. Guided by the ideas of democratic control over implementation of international agreements, we advocate that the role of the public be strongly enhanced, including formation under legislative bodies of control commissions made of parliamentarians and representatives of the public who would exercise in public verification of compliance with the obligations stemming from international agreements.

Since the system of universal security should function on the basis of the charter of the United Nations and its framework, we declare for enhancing the role of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the secretary-general of the United Nations. All the states should give in that the utmost support and should promote greater efficiency of the work of the United Nations and its institutions, their greater contribution to solution of international questions, Vladimir Petrovskiy said in conclusion.

UNESCO's Various Roles, Functions Viewed
PM191245 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 87 First Edition p 4

[Article by Doctor of Philological Sciences V. Koptilov, UNESCO expert: "If All the World's Thinkers..."—boldface italics as published]

[Text] *The General Conference of UNESCO—the UN Educational,Scientific, and Cultural Organization—has elected a new director general. He is famous Spanish*

CPSU's Medvedev Meets Bloc Envoys

PM191630 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Opinions"]

[Text] On 18 November V.A. Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met with the heads of diplomatic missions accredited to Moscow from Bulgaria, Hungary, the SRV, the GDR, the DPRK, Cuba, the PRK, Laos, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, and the CSSR. A talk took place on questions connected with the political results of the celebration of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the bilateral meetings with leaders of the fraternal parties and countries, as well as the meeting of representatives of parties and movements who took part in the jubilee celebrations in Moscow. The participants in the talk, which took place in a warm, friendly atmosphere, exchanged opinions on the further development of the socialist countries' cooperation and their collaboration in international affairs.

scientist Federico Mayor. The important tasks facing this organization and the future prospects of its activity are the topic for serious reflections by its associates.

It is not easy for people in different countries, near and far, to feel that they belong to a united family of peoples. How are they to be prepared to realize the truth that not a single major problem of our time can be solved by the force of arms? How are citizens of different countries to get used to respecting citizens of other countries, at times greatly different in terms of their customs, traditions, and views of the surrounding world?

This is by no means an easy task. It cannot be resolved by reiterating slogans for peace or by general deliberations, no matter how fair they may be. Action is needed. What role could UNESCO play here?

The idea of bringing young people up in the spirit of peace has been increasingly developed in this organization's programs in recent years. We are talking primarily of introducing special sections in school curriculums on history, literature, and geography which would demonstrate the fatal consequences of armed conflicts and the advantages of peaceful development. School textbooks must affirm the idea of the impermissibility of starting a nuclear war and the fatal consequences of the arms race. This is the way to implement the UNESCO Charter stipulation: "Ideas of war develop in people's minds; and therefore the idea of defending peace must be rooted in people's awareness." It is evident that this is a long-term task.

For the time being, however, movie and television screens display supermen armed to the teeth and proclaiming the "right of the strong." The book market is flooded with millions of copies of brutalizing reading matter. People's dissatisfaction with living conditions is channeled against the image of the stranger and potential enemy. People are taught to live in an atmosphere of murder and violence. Furthermore, works passed off as art—often executed to high technical standards, by the way—are capable of killing all that is human in man. Never mind the inculcation of all that is beautiful. Of course, not everyone becomes a professional assassin under the influence of these products, and by no means do all join gangs of cutthroats, but they often turn into consumers of ersatz culture who find Balzac tedious, Dostoyevskiy complex, and Bach boring. Here it is, the real threat that the labor of many generations of builders of human culture may be wiped out. What is needed is an international program of struggle for genuine culture, and who better than UNESCO to head this struggle?

A group of teachers, philosophers, historians, and art experts from various countries could write a textbook for senior school pupils entitled "Introduction to World Culture." Secondary education in all countries in the world is geared to familiarizing pupils with their own culture and studying the literature and history of their own people, since a person should first of all know and love his own country and its past and present. But this is not enough in our time. Unless an adolescent embraces in school the idea that his people's spiritual culture is only a part of the great universal human culture, he may grow up into a narrow-minded nationalist. The perception of people from other nations, races, or religions as "subhuman" underlies the bloody crimes with which mankind's history abounds — from the enslavement of whole peoples in the Ancient World to the extermination of millions of people by the Nazis in the gas chambers of the 20th century. On the threshold of the new millennium, a stance of national isolation and the cultivation of national exclusiveness could lead to irreversible consequences. In the same way that familiarity with another people and knowledge of their specific features are only one step removed from friendship with that people, ignorance and misunderstanding are a hairbreadth away from prejudice and hostility.

UNESCO is doing much to preserve remarkable creations of mankind's material and spiritual culture for our own and future generations. Borobudur, an ancient temple on the island of Java in Indonesia, has been restored. This imposing structure from the early Middle Ages was taken down literally stone by stone, and each stone was numbered, restored, and put back in its place. Borobudur now stands before people in all its original glory. Such scientific and technical tasks and the related expenditure are beyond the capacities of just one state.

The world community is working to save monuments in Vietnam's ancient capital of Hue, historical structures on Isle de Goree in Senegal, and the Central American pyramids which are being swallowed by the jungle. It would be wrong to reduce this work to just financial assistance being drawn from a common pool. UNESCO sends highly skilled scientific experts to isolated and at times dangerous locations. In cooperation with local authorities and specialists, they draw up plans and blueprints and organize working groups to restore ancient masterpieces.

Federico Felini's movie "Roma" contains a memorable scene. While drilling a tunnel, subway builders discover an antique hall whose walls are covered in frescoes. But the 20th century's breath — the air saturated with gasoline fumes and factory smoke — rushes into the underground chamber and, before our very eyes, the paintings pale, dim, and fade away and we are left with nothing but bare walls. This screen parable speaks of the fragility and vulnerability of the products of human genius. But it also has another meaning: Any encounter of two civilizations, especially if they are separated from one another by time or distance, must be painstakingly prepared. Is it easy for Europeans to understand the mythology of Australia's aborigines? After all, even Homer's myth, a European myth dating back almost 30 centuries, is far from fully understood by Europeans themselves.

30Scientists who discover the universal human values created by different peoples and translators who surmount language barriers act as "cultural links." UNESCO pools the efforts by these people. The USSR's example in publishing a unique 200-volume "Library of World Literature" had an inspiring effect on UNESCO's work to popularize outstanding works by the world's peoples. For example, it publishes in different languages books from classical Japanese, Chinese, Arab, and Indian literature little known beyond the borders of the corresponding countries.

Of course, the effect of UNESCO's educational activity would be considerably greater were there not 900 million people in the world unable to read. It is, therefore, natural that the program to spread literacy has become one of UNESCO's major programs, focusing on the training of specialists to conduct mass campaigns, at times on the scale of whole countries. But even if they are successfully implemented, there still remains the threat of the so-called "relapses into illiteracy" which could wipe off all previous efforts. After all, someone who is taught to read and write is in no position to maintain the skills he has acquired without regular contacts with newspapers, journals, and books. However, far from all developing countries can afford the publication of even textbooks in their native languages, and thousands of "new illiterates" who have forgotten how to read start to reemerge. This is just one example of the difficulties encountered along the way of implementing UNESCO's projects. Even so, however, the 40 years of its persistent work are yielding sound results: The percentage of people who have mastered basic literacy is steadily rising. Not a single illiterate person on Earth by the year 2000 — that is the organization's goal.

....The UNESCO Charter reads: "Peace must be based on mankind's intellectual and moral solidarity." This is, to a certain extent, the formula of the future. It is the duty of every thinking person to bring it closer to reality.

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze Receives Ambassador Matlock

LD191848 Moscow TASS in English 1836 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 19 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, today received the U.S. Ambassador in Moscow Jack Matlock for a conversation during which they discussed questions connected with the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting.

Shultz, Shevardnadze To Meet 23-24 Nov

LD200739 Moscow TASS in English 0734 GMT 20 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 20 TASS—From a TASS diplomatic correspondent:

It was confirmed in the official quarters in Moscow that by mutual agreement Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the U.S.S.R., would meet with George Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, in Geneva on November 23-24 in order to finalize the work of the medium- and shorter-range missiles treaty and discuss matters related to preparations for an official visit of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the United States in December 1987.

As agreed by the Soviet and American sides, an official announcement to this effect will be made at 5:00 p.m. (Moscow time) today.

Officials Visit U.S. Chemical Weapons Plant

LD201138 Moscow TASS in English 1100 GMT 20 Nov 87

[text] Tooele, Utah, November 20 TASS—TASS correspondent Vladislav Orlov reports:

To Major General R.F. Razuvanov a trip here, to the U.S. military base located not far from Salt Lake City, the administrative centre of Utah, is of particular interest.

The commandant of the Soviet military facility at Shikhanyy, he had recently played host to foreign representatives who had familiarized themselves with the standard specimens of chemical munitions which the Armed Forces of the USSR have in service and with a chemical weapons destruction technology.

One month and a half after that, among a delegation of Soviet experts and diplomats, Razuvanov arrived at the largest depot of chemical weapons in the United States. According to official data, about 42 per cent of the U.S. entire arsenal of chemical munitions is concentrated in the stony desert valley located in-between the snow-capped mountains: stacks of shells, rockets, aerial bombs, mines, and containers with highly-toxic gases and liquids. Many of them are kept for decades and become unfit for use. U.S. specialists admitted there had been instances of 'migration of toxic agents', which the U.S. press described with words more understandable to the uninitiated—'a leak of poisonous gases'. A pilot plant for the destruction of chemical weapons has been functioning at the territory of the base at Tooele for a number of years, and a technology for this complex and highly dangerous process is being tried out.

Experts of the U.S. Department of Defence and the servicemen of the base showed specimens of chemical munitions which are in service with the U.S. Army to Soviet representatives and journalists accompanying him, acquainted them with their technical characteristics, and recounted to them the peculiarities of the effect of various types of toxic agents on the human organism. They spoke in detail of various safety measures being taken to protect the personnel of the base who are constantly side by side with the 'quiet death'.

"We regard the visit to Tooele as a confidence-building measure and as furtherance of the Soviet Union's act", Yuriy Nazarkin, the leader of the Soviet delegation, representative of the USSR at the conference on disarmament, has told journalists.

"In our view, such exchange of visits improves the atmosphere during the discussion of a convention banning chemical weapons. The process of work on the document has entered the concluding stage, and it may be signed as early as in the first half of 1988".

"At this responsible period, it is exceptionally important that all sides show political will and not take steps which would hinder them from reaching decision to exclude chemical weapons from the arsenals of the means of warfare."

Meanwhile, there appear indications that some Western negotiators apparently seek to modernize chemical weapons, and not to eliminate them.

At one of display stands at the exhibition in Tooele, Soviet delegates and journalists saw an artillery GB-2 shell of binary type. Army representatives said that a flow-line assembly of binary chemical munitions—the newest variety of weapons of mass destruction—would begin in the United States before the end of the year.

Yakubov on Iran-Contras Affair, Reagan Role

LD192134 Moscow TASS in English 1533 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 19 TASS—Commentator Dmitriy Yakubov writes:

A report drawn up by special commissions of the Congress investigating the Iran-contras affair has been made public. It sums up the results of ten months of work involving the study of thousands of documents and hearing hundreds of witnesses. Historians, jurists and politicians will yet long study these results. A thorough study of the report certainly will produce many interesting facts some of which either were not known at all or were known only in part.

At present the attention of the world public is drawn to the main conclusions of the report. They boil down to admitting that officials of the U.S. Administration have flagrantly violated laws and rules regulating the activity of government institutions.

The report says that officials closest to the President, staff members of the National Security Council had deliberately made false statements to Congress in an attempt to conceal arms deliveries to Iran that were in violation of the law on control over the export of arms. In other words, White House officials flouted legislation when it contradicted political aims. The importance of this conclusion in the report cannot be underestimated.

At the same time the report does not offer a clear answer to the question of President Reagan's role in the Iran-contras affair. The authors of the report explain the absence of such an answer by the fact that at the beginning of the investigation many important documents were deliberately destroyed by the main figures inthe Irangate affair—Poindexter and North. The death of the CIA director Casey is another explanation. The authors of the report contend that this prevented them from fully restoring the chronology of events in this critically important question. The report does not contain a conclusion on what exactly the head of the White House knew about what was happening. But neither is there a conclusion on what he did not know. The document concludes by saying that in the final analysis responsibility for the Iran-contras affair should rest with President Reagan. It says that if the President did not know what his National Security assistants were doing he ought to have known. It is difficult not to agree with this. One cannot deny logic in the following comment on the report by the French newspaper *Le Matin*: "Irangate has seriously undermined Reagan's authority and influence and judging by everything he will not succeed in regaining his lost positions".

House Votes To Limit Stinger Deliveries

LD191851 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] Washington November 19 TASS—The U.S. House of Representatives has voted for limitation of foreign deliveries of American Stinger anti-aircraft missiles. By a majority of 322 votes against 93 the congressmen approved the amendment to the bill on aid to foreign states now under discussion. The amendment prohibits Stinger deliveries to countries which are not NATO members or U.S. major allies as, for instance, Israel. Democratic Congressman Mel Levine, a co-author of the amendment, said that the Stinger missile was one of the most dangerous and lethal weapons that can fall into the hands of terrorists.

It is exactly such missiles that the United States supplies to Afghan dushmans in big batches. The use of Stinger missiles by terrorists has already led to deaths of scores of civil plane passengers, including children and women.

The amendment however provides for exceptions from restrictions on Stinger exports in case of "unforeseen circumstances" or in case the President substantiates the need of deliveries of such missiles to certain states.

Senate Endorses 1988 Military Budget

LD200742 Moscow TASS in English 0737 GMT 20 Nov 87

[Text] Washington November 20 TASS—The military budget of the United States for 1988 fiscal year, beginning on October 1, was endorsed on Thursday by the U.S. Senate, without a long debate. 86 senators voted for the bill approved the day before by the House of Representatives, while 9 were against.

Endorsed by both chambers, the bill elaborated through difficult negotiations between the House-Senate Conference Committee and the White House, envisages the military appropriations of up to 296,000 million dollars. It is now to be signed by the President.

Pravdin Notes Bering Sea Military Maneuvers

LD191340 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 18 Nov 87

[Commentary by Sergey Pravdin, from the "International Diary" program, presented by Vitaliy Sobolev]

[Excerpt] Major military maneuvers of the U.S. 3d Fleet's ships and air force have just ended in the Bering Sea. Over now to my colleague Sergey Pravdin who will tell us about these military exercises, and his views on their aims:

[Pravdin] For 9 days vast areas of the Bering Sea have been closed to shipping. Shells and depth charges have exploded there. Missiles were being launched into the air while naval aircraft, taking off from the deck of the aircraft carrier *Enterprise* flew over various sections of the Bering Sea. According to UPI reports, they were testing the latest U.S. antisubmarine weapons. A missile crusier and several nuclear submarines also took part in the maneuvers. Over 10,000 servicemen participated in them.

As already mentioned, the maneuvers were held in the northern areas of Alaska and the Bering Sea, in other words, in the direct vicinity of the USSR's border. Among other things, the statement by Admiral (Conner), under whose command the maneuvers were held, show their provocative nature. While speaking to U.S. journalists, who came to the maneuvers in great number, (Conner) stated, and I quote: The purpose of our being in the Bering Sea is not to hunt white bears. The United States, he said, is testing its latest weapons under the conditions of Arctic climate and is training its servicemen to conduct military actions against some imagined enemy under Far Eastern conditions.

It seems unnecessary to decipher who this supposed enemy is for the U.S. admiral. Why does the United States need to hold "Norpacex" maneuvers in the immediate vicinity of the USSR's border and precisely at this time, right before the USSR-United States summit meeting. *The Washington Post* newspaper seems to have the right answer. I quote from an editorial: There is no doubt that at the third Soviet-U.S. summit meeting the U.S. side intends to act from the same position of strength, although, the U.S. newspaper adds, this position has already failed many times in the talks with the USSR.

Well, this is an essential addition. Even more so, because the stand of our country, as far as the forthcoming meeting is concerned, is honest and open. Soviet officials have stressed many times that an agreement on medium and shorter range missiles must become the first stage on the path of nuclear disarmament. [passage omitted]

'Capital to Capital' Telebridge Program

LD191117 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0430 GMT 19 Nov 87

[U.S.-USSR telebridge titled "Capital to Capital," moderated on the U.S side by ABC journalist Peter Jennings, with the participation of U.S. Senators Bill Bradley and Nancy Kassebaum; presented on the Soviet side by "Observer" Leonid Zolotarevskiy, with the participation of Supreme Soviet members Yevgeniy Primakov and Aleksey Yeliseyev—live; U.S. participants in English with superimposed Russian translation]

[Excerpts] [Peter Jennings] Good evening, I'm Peter Jennings in Washington. Once again we welcome you all. An unusual meeting is taking place: Members of the Supreme Soviet will meet U.S. congressmen and senators. The broadcast will be live. Such broadcasts were held in September, when the subject was mutual security and arms control, and in October human rights questions were examined. More than 300 million people saw these telebridges, and today is the third telebridge in our series.

[Unidentified speaker] Deputies from the Supreme Soviet have assembled in Moscow, in the Kremlin, and in the Capitol in Washington, representatives of the U.S. Congress. Capital speaks to capital on the eve of the summit meeting. Peter Jennings presents the program from Washington. [video shows camera panning around audience in the Capitol showing a close-up of Anatoliy Shcharanskiy]

[Jennings] If you were with us even only partially during the first two telebridges, you would know that from both sides the participants spoke quite openly and frankly. We have an esteemed panel today.

Senator Nancy Kassebaum of Kansas: She is a Republican and a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Senator Bill Bradley of New Jersey, who is a Democrat and a member of the Intelligence Committee, among others. The principal Soviet guests tonight are Yevgeniy Primakov, a member of the Central Committee. In the Soviet Union he has publicly endorsed cutting the defense budget in order to redirect the country's resources. And Aleksey Yeliseyev, also a member of the Supreme Soviet and a former cosmonaut. He has been in space three times and was the Soviet's mission controller during the "Apollo"-"Soyuz" space flight in 1975. [preceding paragraph in English without superimposed Russian translation]

[Zolotarevskiy] While Peter Jennings is presenting his panel, permit me to present those who are appearing before you. They are Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee, and Aleksey Stanislavovich Yeliseyev, rector of the Moscow Bauman Higher Technical College, twice Hero of the Soviet Union. [Video shows members of Soviet panel]

[Unidentified speaker] After the broadcast, many Soviet citizens telephoned the ABC offices in Moscow. The subject was human rights. At the ABC studios in Washington, emigres surrounded the Soviet Embassy and asked for exit visas for members of their families. We would like him [not further identified], as a man, to understand the suffering of members of our families. [video shows man and caption Leon Charny, divided family member] This was Venyamin Charny. Yelena Balovlenkova, [video close-up] who was in the Washington panel that month, has now received news that her husband, Yuriy, has been allowed to leave the Soviet Union. This meeting took place in Vienna yesterday. [video shows two people embracing] After 8 years, the Charny family, which was a subject of discussion in the telebridge, was able to be united in the West. This was broadcast by Walter Rogers, an ABC correspondent in Moscow.

[Jennings] Before starting our discussion I want to say that I have not yet introduced one of the participants from the Soviet side, that is Soviet presenter Leonid Zolotarevskiy. Good evening, Leonid! I would like to tell our audience again that Leonid was a Soviet television correspondent in Afghanistan and is an eminent Soviet observer. Very nice to see you again, Leonid. May we put the first question to Mr Primakov.

Mr Primakov, in the United States we have been closely following the course of Mr Gorbachev's policy of detente, very closely. Many of us are puzzled. The leader of the Moscow Gorkom, Mr Yeltsin, was dismissed last week. As we understand it, he criticized Mr Gorbachev over the fact that the reforms are proceeding too slowly. Surely criticism is welcomed under glasnost?

[Primakov] Well, look here, you are turning everything on its head, because Comrade Yeltsin was released from his duties as first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom because he was not equal to the task and could not cope with his tasks as secretary of such an organization as the Moscow party organization. This is one of the central organizations. At the same time I am surprised that you are not sufficiently informed because it was reported yesterday that Comrade Yeltsin has been appointed first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Construction in the office of minister of the USSR. So I think that this answer will rule out any further questions from you about Comrade Yeltsin.

[Jennings] Yes, indeed, we know that now he will be number two in construction matters in the Soviet Union, but we are still puzzled, because we did not hear his own remarks. Are there any reasons for this?

[Primakov] Well, I don't think that all Soviet party figures should address themselves to the United States of America. In the same way, I don't feel that all your Democrat senators or Republican senators are obliged to address their point of view—obliged, I would like to stress—to the U.S. audience, I mean the Soviet audience.

If you wish to listen to my colleague and friend, Cosmonaut Yeliseyev, Deputy Yeliseyev, who took part in the debate on this quesiton in the Moscow Gorkom, he might like to say a few words on this.

[Yeliseyev] It seems to me you have already put it fairly well. Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin spoke at the Moscow Gorkom plenum. He failed to cope with the job of running the Moscow organization as he couldn't keep pace with those movements and trends of democratization in the party's work. He was a proponent of tough administrative measures. This is disconsonant with today's trends in party work. Therefore, it was considered correct to release him from this office. Yeltsin himself is a builder by profession, and he has today been appointed to very major construction work in our country.

[Primakov] Incidentally, the speech at the Moscow Gorkom plenum was published in all our papers.

[Jennings] Henry Bradley [as heard].

[Bradley] Allow me to say a few words. It may be that the Soviet side does not know too well that the whole world is watching them, and many Americans believe—from the point of view of our relations—that what is possible for you is very important. General Secretary Gorbachev urged us to view your internal reforms as testimony to your sincerity and seriousness, and that is precisely why we have turned to domestic issues in the Soviet Union, and glasnost is one of the two main themes; restructuring is the second theme.

Glasnost, as we understand it in this country, is not freedom of speech as we understand it and which is guaranteed by our laws, but permission to choose one's words. Some people believe that such a right emerges by virtue of the fact that, when opinions clash, a better policy results. So, Mr Yeltsin, who was one of the main proponents of glasnost, now no longer occupies his post.

From the point of view of what Mr Gorbachev said about glasnost, here two questions concern us: Firstly, will glasnost come to naught and what will happen to all those young economists and others who have put forward new ideas in the Soviet economy? What will happen to them? What will happen to the young people in the theater who are calling for a new theater in Moscow? Will they disappear, too? Will this affect the overall situation—perhaps there will be less debate of acute questions in your country? The second question which comes to my mind is this: Has this in any way weakened the position of General Secretary Gorbachev?

[Unidentified speaker] If we may interrupt you for a moment, Senator Bradley, let us look at the questions in turn, one after the other.

[Yeliseyev] If I may, can I...

[Jennings interrupts] Yes, of course.

[Yeliseyev] I am a little surprised at the way the question was put. You yourself invented the version that Yeltsin violated the principle of glasnost—or that Yeltsin was devoted to glasnost—and therefore he was released from office. His release from office has nothing whatever to do with glasnost. Glasnost is being established in our country today and Yeltsin was devoted to it—as was everybody else who discussed the results of Yeltsin's work over the past 2 years. So you are wasting your efforts by quarreling with your own version. But, as far as economic problems and the problems of our theater are concerned, a great advance is really being made here. Today, economists are working on the development of the economy and new theaters are being created. You know, one of our oldest theaters—the Arts Theater—has essentially been split into two. In other words, new theatrical principles are also being established today. It seems to me that this subject is not really of interest for discussion at this point when such a major meeting is approaching and when there are conflicts in the world which concern us all. Let us go back to problems where we could, by pooling our efforts, bring some benefit to the international situation.

[Primakov] I would still like to add a few words. Firstly, what we are doing in our country? In the main, we are now implementing democratization and carrying out reform of the economic mechanism. This is a line which will never and in no circumstances be disrupted. In no circumstances! As far as glasnost is concerned, and everything that we are doing in our country, then it is probable that the American people find it difficult to grasp this matter. But I would still like to call Senator Bradley to this point: Understand this, we are doing this for ourselves and not for you—for us and not for you. Do you understand? Of course, we want people to speak well of us, but this is not being done so that the Americans think of us as such or in such and such a way. If one is talking about Yeltsin, then in principle you have absolutely the wrong information on this matter. I am even amazed that a member of the Senate, with such little information at his disposal, puts the question in such a way as you have.

[Zolotarevskiy] A point of order, Peter, a point of order!

[Jennings] Senator Kassebaum also wants to react.

[Kassebaum] I think I would like to second what Senator Bradley had to say. Our people are very concerned at what is happening in the Soviet Union today. I believe that the great interest which is being shown in the Soviet Union in this broadcast shows that both our people and your people are striving for mutual understanding. The policy of reforms which has begun has quite obviously led to glasnost and openness, and this program is proof of this. We understand the important questions facing you in connection with the forthcoming summit meeting. I would like to say that we live at a particularly important time in relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. It is very important to understand one another. In my state, people ask: Can we trust the Svoiet Government? It is natural to ask the question: Can we trust the U.S. Government? We must understand each other. I think these programs have been very useful, particularly preceding a summit meeting, and if an agreement is signed it will be necessary to decide what we are to do. This is very important. [passage omitted: Jennings thanks her and introduces the commercial break]

[Zolotarevskiy]...Rapidly, so I did not have time to introduce your guests, your senators who are speaking on behalf of the Congress today. [sentence as heard] I would like to do that now. You can see, comrades, Senator Nancy Kassebaum—she is on the left—and Senator Bill Bradley, who are taking part in the discussion on the U.S. side. Now, Peter, just a couple of words on procedural matters.

[Jennings] Leonid, you sure are fond of procedural matters!

[Zolotarevskiy] Yes, Peter, sometimes I am very fond of them. So, before the commercial break, our conversation had begun to take a correct, constructive turn, thanks of course, to the lady. Women always bring peace to the home, in this case our big world home. As far as what was said at the very beginning of the program is concerned to the effect that in previous programs there had been maximum frankness and lack of inhibition—this is certainly so, although, to be honest, we were sometimes astonished at the form of this uninhibitedness, which led the U.S. congressmen and senators to make statements which caused, to put it mildly, amazement, and frequently protests, not only in our audience here, but also from our viewers. Therefore, I would like again to express the opinion that the turn which the conversation was taking just now before the commercial break was the right direction for our conversation to take, and I hope it will continue in this vein. I have finished with procedural matters, Peter. Let's get on and continue the discussion.

[Jennings] It's your turn now to ask the next question, so go ahead, please.

[Yeliseyev] Well, I proposed devoting time to discussing international problems in which we could join forces. A very favorable situation for this has now become about in Central America. You know that a conference has been held in Guatemala, and that the presidents of five countries signed a good agreement on procedure for establishing peace in this region. You know that Nicaragua is the first country to begin implementing these procedures: Peace commissions have been set up there, a dialogue with the opposition is being conducted, and the opposition has been granted access to the press and radio. But it has not yet been possible to achieve a normal situation because the contras are continuing their bandit actions, and unfortunately they are using weapons obtained from the United States. Tell us what measures we can take here. Why has the United States not so far responded to the appeal by the five presidents, and why is aid still going to these antigovernment groups, which are acting from outside under the instruction of U.S. instructors and using U.S. weapons?

[Jennings] Senator Kassebaum.

[Kassebaum] I think the efforts of these countries to achieve peace in the region should be supported. Congress supports these results. I think one must take into account the existence of opposition to the Sandinist government. I would like to ask you about it. We have gone along this time with [pause] we support it. You—who in the period 1980-86 delivered arms worth more than $5 million [figure as heard; Kassebaum says in English: "about $105 million to the Sandinista government"]—what do you think about this matter?

[Yeliseyev] Firstly I am very pleased to hear you say you favor a settlement of the conflict and that you welcome the process which has begun with the decision in Guatemala. I wish to recall that the Soviet Union began delivering weapons for defense against these aggressive actions from the territory of other states, and as you know, these are purely defensive weapons, either small arms, or helicopters, which have no relation to aggression. Therefore, if your further efforts lead to success, if actions from outside cease, we believe that a normal situation will transpire in Nicaragua based on democratism and nonalignment which is now being pursued by the Sandinist government, then we reckon there will be success there.

[Bradley] Returning to what you said about Americans being interested in supporting the process of achieving peace; I was in Costa Rica a week before various initiatives were put forward, including that of President Duarte's. I returned with the impression that increased interest in one's own democracy would lead also to reinforcement of democracy everywhere. This is what is happening now in Central America. We hope that all problems will be resolved. We also know that the plan entails not only the cutting of aid from outside, but also of assistance to rebels in other regions of Central America; it entails democratization and full amnesty. We think that if all this works out a most successful outcome will be achieved.

[Primakov] Senator Bradley, do you think that the Sandinistas are a surrogate for the Soviets, as some Americans do?

[Bradley] The Sandinistas have their own agenda and it is precisely the aid to the contras that prompted them to reach the peace agreement. We now hope that concrete results will be achieved and that the contras themselves will be prepared to sign an agreement. This was not previously the case.

[Primakov] I would like that to be the case, and we know of the efforts being made by a number of our colleagues from the U.S. Congress to achieve a settlement on a healthy basis. Specifically, our press has given very wide coverage to the mission of Speaker of the House Wright. We know about the press conference held by Democratic Senator Dodd, which is also appraised most highly by the Soviet public. But, unfortunately, the administration does not always, so to speak, act in the direction that many U.S. congressmen make manifest. For example, recently the Nicaraguan president was in the United States, yet neither the President nor any representative of the U.S. leadership met him. This was an opportunity when it would have been possible to get into contact and to come to agreement, or at least to start off such contacts. How can this happen? Congress is disposed...

[Bradley, interrupts] Mr Primakov, I would like to interrupt.

[Primakov] A minute, 1 minute, I ask you not to interrupt.

[Bradley] All right.

[Primakov] I want to say to you are such an advocate...

[Bradley interrupts] I want to ask one question, to clarify something...

[Primakov interrupts] A minute, 1 minute. You advocate human rights, and I have the right to set forth my position, so why are you depriving me of this right? I want to say that perhaps, if White House representatives had met Ortega things would have advanced. So why does Congress not put pressure on the administration so that the most favorable condtions might come about for solving this problem? That is the question I wanted to ask.

[Bradley] You have asked a question, now may I ask you one?

[Primakov] No, first answer that one...

[Bradley interrupts] Do you know that the speaker of the House of Representatives and the secretary of state yesterday agreed on a six-point plan for foreign policy to be regulated by the White House, and not the speaker?

[Primakov] Well, in that case, I would prefer the speaker to be regulating policy in respect of Nicaragua. Forgive me.

[Zolotarevskiy] Peter, you're speaking about questions of procedure. But the fact is that Yevgeniy Primakov asked a question and did not get an answer. Please, Peter, let's do things so that answers are given to questions, first and foremost.

[Bradley] I'll answer. I'll try to answer you.

[Primakov] Thank you.

[Bradley] The question is: Why did the President not meet Ortega? I don't know why, but I think the main problem is that the democracies themselves, the countries themselves in Central America have to resolve their own problems. Of course, there is the question of ending aid, but initially they have to resolve other issues, say, a cease-fire between rebels and government troops in all countries of Central America. That cease-fire, of course, is very, very difficult to secure. Talks have to be held on this within the region itself. Moreover, Daniel Ortega in Nicaragua and Duarte [pause] in Nicaragua [as heard] must themselves be confident that the insurgents will not enter their territory from outside. That is, the democratic states of Central America must resolve these problems themselves; it is they who are up against these problems and they who must implement the plan. This plan must not be dictated to them either from Washington or from Moscow.

[Jennings] We will soon speak about Afghanistan, another regional issue, but now a break. [passage omitted: U.S. advertisements, each given a brief introduction by the Russian interpreter]

[Jennings] Welcome back. It is now morning in the Soviet Union and evening in the United States. We are being watched by perhaps 100 million viewers in the Soviet Union, and a huge number of Americans. This is the third meeting between representatives of the U.S. Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet. Let us now talk about Afghanistan. The Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in 1979, if I'm right, Senator Bradley?

[Bradley] That's so. However, I would like to approach this issue from a different angle. We, Americans, are a nation of immigrants, we like to travel. I have travelled to the Soviet Union, I have been in the Crimea, Yalta, Odessa, Novosibirsk, Moscow and Leningrad, Irkutsk too, and talked to your writer Valenin Rasputin, and seen Lake Baykal, so I have a much better idea of the Soviet Union than if I had never been to that country. When quite young, I traveled around Afghanistan. In northeast Afghanistan I was in (Gun) Valley. It is precisely these areas that have been destroyed as a result of the military efforts of the Soviet troops in these areas, and I feel, of course, compassion for the parents of the Soviet soldiers who have died in Afghanistan. They were told that they were defending socialism against a hostile population; they were aware of the danger, and many of them died. I think this was a mistake. I think that many of you consider it was a mistake, and I hope that you will withdraw your troops.

[Primakov] I would like to say the following on this: There is a political decision on withdrawing our troops from Afghanistan. In fact, when our contingent was sent there, it was perfectly clear straight away that this was a temporary measure, and now there is a political decision on the withdrawal of the troops from Afghanistan. But I would ask you, Senator Bradley, hand on heart, so to speak, can you state firmly that in the United States—and I have in mind the U.S. leadership, inluding the military leadership—there are no forces that would like us to keep our troops in Afghanistan, considering that thus we are weakening ourselves? I would ask you to answer that question.

[Bradley] I would answer your question like this: Of course, Soviet history is a testament to your continually having to repel attacks from outside, and the Soviet Union, of course, understands that the difficulties of any withdrawal from the territory of another state are the burden of the one who first crossed the border. The Soviet Union, I think, should simply withdraw its troops from Afghanistan, and it is not difficult to do this; you only have to recognize the mistake. Countries make mistakes, and grow by admitting their mistakes.

[Jennings] Is such a troop withdrawal possible, Mr Primakov?

[Primakov] Well, you have not answered my question! This is why I asked it: At the institute where I work some research was recently done, and we came to the conclusion that the United States has now reached a peak in the supply of weapons to the bandits, also in the quality, so to speak, of the weaponry being supplied. This has come at precisely the time when efforts are being made in Afghanistan to create a coalition government, to stabilize the situation, in order that all—including those who are now bearing arms, fighting against the Afghan Government in Kabul—be included in that government. So how do you explain that the United States is at this very time supplying so many and such quality weapons to the bandits? It seems to me that this testifies to the fact that you want to inhibit the process of withdrawal of our troops from there. So, please explain the situation from that standpoint.

[Jennings] Senator Kassebaum.

[Kassebaum] The issue is related to the speedier withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. I think that certain progress has been made on the level of your efforts to withdraw the troops. This is related to the existence of the coalition government, and I think that we can only welcome the start of this process.

[Jennings] What would you like the United States to do, Mr Primakov, for the Soviet Union to be able to withdraw its troops? Is some kind of cooperation between us possible?

[Primakov] I would like to propose to you—although, believe me, I as a deputy to the Supreme Soviet, have not put this to the Soviet Government, I am speaking on my own behalf—I would like to propose this option: Say, for instance, the United States announces the cessation of weapons supplies to the bandits and we at that time reach an agreement on the timetable for the withdrawal of our troops. Then, once you have announced this, albeit temporarily, say, for 1 year, you see what happens in that time—we will withdraw the troops. You understand? Let's link these two things. You are worried most of all by the presence of our troops there, as I understand it. We are very worried by your supplying weapons to those forces which are fighting against the government at a time when this government is proposing to set up a coalition leadership. So let's work together on these questions, us and you.

[Jennings] Senator Kassebaum.

[Kassebaum] Mr Primakov, I don't think you in the Soviet Union really understand the devasting impact of your invasion of Afghanistan. Remember the SALT II negotiations. It poisoned relations for many years, because the invasion of Afghanistan aroused suspicions about what you want in Afghanistan, and the cruelty of your action. I think the responsibility for solving this question lies on your shoulders, not on ours.

[Primakov] Madam Senator, I answered the question which your presenter put to me. I put a question to you, but I do not find that you have given any answer to it.

This way, we are really confirming what you said in the opening clips, that it is a dialogue of the deaf. Let's answer each other's questions!

[Jennings] Don't be shy, Senator!

[Kassebaum] I thought I answered it.

[Bradley] As you know, Mr Primakov, the main thing is that the Soviet Union hopes too end up with conditions in which the situation will be controlled by the government it wants. We want a more moderate government, and to be frank, in the negotiations which have been going on and are continuing now, the Soviet Union refuses to set any sort of timetable for withdrawal, perhaps because you have not yet understood that you must withdraw, because this is in your own interests. We should like to help you of course, but first of all we have to deal with this basic question of principle. [passage omitted: Jennings introduces next commercial break]

[Jennings] Over to Soviet moderator Leonid Zolotarevskiy.

[Zolotarevskiy] I give the floor to Deputy Yelisyev, who would like to comment on the discussion on Afghanistan we have just had.

[Yeliseyev] A brief comment. First, I would like categorically to delete the term: Invasion by Soviet troops. I would like to remind you that the Afghan Government asked us more than 10 times to send troops to give them assistance against outside attacks. You know that we have friendly relations with Afghanistan and we responded to the government's request, at the same time that the United States was helping not the government but antigovernment formations from another country.

[Bradley] I ask you!

[Yeliseyev] To go back to the question of what we would suggest, I think that together—and I simply repeat what my colleague Primakov said—we must simultaneously reach agreement on stopping aid to these formations, the Soviet troops will be withdrawn from Afghanistan, and the situation there will return to normal on the basis of democratism, on the basis of the action of the commissions for reconciliation that now exist.

[Primakov] Incidentally, I would just like to add one thing. I take an optimistic view of the course of events, because there is, I repeat, a political decision on the withdrawal of the troops. Even so they will be withdrawn, and then, it seems to me, one good outcome could be a new round of talks between...

[Bradley interrupts] When?

[Primakov, continues] Pakistan and Afghanistan. When? I can ask you, when will you stop arms supplies, when will you stop the incursions from the territory of others into Afghanistan, the training of the bandits on the territory of others, and so forth. Let's solve the matter together. I think it's all not far off, not far off. If you like...

[Bradley interrupts] Mr Primakov.

[Primakov] Yes?

[Bradley] You answer every question with a question.

[Primakov] No, I answer you...

[Bradley interrupts] But we are not sitting at the negotiating table.

[Primakov] That's right.

[Bradley] When you say that the Government of Afghanistan asked you to come in, we know that the Afghan ambassador to Czechoslovakia, who was in Moscow, made this invitation. I do not think I can believe that the invitation came from a legitimate and organized Afghan government.

[Primakov] Well, you know, we'll argue until the second coming, as they say. I think now that it would be absolutely unconstructive [laughter from Americans] to argue.

[Yeliseyev] You have to ask the Government of Afghanistan.

[Primakov] We'll prove to you that it was legitimate, you'll tell us that it was not legitimate. I want to say just this to you in this respect: You, Senator Bradley, have just said that you are for a moderate government that would include all political forces in Afghanistan; we are for this, too. Let us look at how we can create this. The Afghan leadership, strictly speaking, solves these questions; the Afghan people solve these questions, and it is now conducting a policy of national reconciliation. It is perfectly clear. The doors of the coalition government are open. It is prepared to allocate 50% of its posts to other parties, even the post of prime minister, and so on. So how can one talk about maintaining power for one party, and so on, to the isolation of all others. This is incorrect: It is an incorrect interpretation of what is happening in Afghanistan. So let's help this process of stabilization in Afghanistan, and proceed from the fact that we do not want Afghanistan to be socialist, as you put it; this is an incorrect point of view. We want Afghanistan to be independent, that Afghanistan be neutral. I want to emphasize this once again, neutral, nonaligned, whatever it wants to be, and we want to have friendly relations with Afghanistan. This is perfectly understandable. We have a 2,500-km border with Afghanistan.

[Jennings] Mr Primakov.

[Primakov] Yes, I am listening, Peter. Would you like...

[Jennings interrupts] I just wanted to say that you have made it sound very eloquent; of course we cannot solve the problems in one discussion, but it will be very important, when Mr Gorbachev and Mr Reagan meet, what they will talk about. I would like to propose to the participants in the discussion from both sides, and those in the audience, to voice their own opinions, ideas and comments. In the United States there are many opinions on this subject. Congressman Robert Dornan, California.

[Dornan, shown standing at back of hall] Peter, I would like to address my question to Mr Zolotarevskiy, who is presenting this program. Mr Zolotarevskiy, as I understand it, you said that you were almost indignant when you were watching and speaking in the previous programs. However, the question which I would like to ask might also arouse your indignation, and, incidentally, like Senator Bradley, I have also been to your country more than once. I have been to the Caspian Sea, I have been to Leningrad and Kiev. It is a beautiful country, and I believe that your people are very much like ours, and your people are very energetic and enterprising, and I think that this is undoubtedly very important. However, I would like to ask this question: When he comes—the general secretary—he will be able to meet with representatives of the most varied social classes, although he will not be speaking in the U.S. Congress. The fact is that in our country it is not accepted that people may speak, people who are responsible for all cases where people have been killed, Soviets and other people have been killed, and no one has yet made any apologies for this. Could Mr Gorbachev make an apology for those murders, perhaps compensate in some way for the murder, say, of Lieutenant Colonel Nicholson, who was killed in East Germany?

[Zolotarevskiy] Senator Dornan, you are right, what you said undoubtedly aroused my indignation, and I think it aroused the indignation of all those Soviet people who are watching this program or who will see the repeat of it this evening. I consider what you have said to be a direct attack on a very respected person, our high-ranking leader, who will be your guest in 2 weeks' time. I believe what you have said to be not only tactless but politically irresponsible. Pardon my abruptness, but that is my point of view.

[Primakov] I would like to add the following...

[Jennings interrupts] Just a moment, one moment. I would like to add the following.

[Primakov] I would just like to say thank goodness this point of view is not supported by the vast majority of the U.S. population, who, judging from the polls, are now taking a very favorable attitude to our leader and understand what great work he is doing to introduce the principles of peace into international practice, how much he is doing to ensure that everything is now in order in the world. We are receiving thousands of letters, tens of thousands, telephone calls and so on, welcoming the visit of the general secretary to the United States. Then I should just like to say, (?isolated) voices won't achieve anything. But world peace really depends on the relations between our two countries, so you too really need this visit no less than we do; one could even say more than we do. That should be the starting point.

[Bradley] Mr Primakov, let me share my reminiscences. In 1964 I was a member of the U.S. Olympic basketball team, and we played against the Soviet team in the Olympic Games. I was playing against a Soviet forward who was much taller than me. Two or 3 minutes after the game began, his elbow caught me in the throat. It was terribly painful. I said to him: Look out, be more careful! To put it more simply, I said, let's have respect for each other. This is surely a good message which can help us to respect each other. Let's move on from there.

[Primakov] I agree with you, Mr Senator, but I find it difficult to imagine anyone who could be taller than you! I think if someone hit you like that he must have learned the trick from professional U.S. basketball players!

[Jennings] Mr Primakov, I am sorry to say you have still not answered Congressman Dornan's question. As I understand it, what he wants to know is, will the general secretary apologize to the family of the congressman who perished in the Korean airliner or will he not? I think that's a fair question.

[Primakov] I don't think it's a fair question at all.

[Jennings] Thank you. We'll be back in just a moment. [passage omitted; commercial break]

[Jennings] It has been mentioned a number of times that in the near future Mr Gorbachev will meet Mr Reagan, and of course, all eyes will be riveted on this meeting. The main thing is that they are due to sign an agreement on the elimination of a whole category of nuclear armaments.

[Kassebaum] It is important to say a few words about the summit meeting. There is no need to overstate the prospects. There has been a lot of media-hype in our country about this event. I think that the destruction of a whole class of nuclear weapons is an important step. It will be successful if it is followed by subsequent steps, in particular, on a reduction in conventional armaments, and a reduction in strategic offensive missiles. My next question would be this: Do you think one can expect these two issues to be raised during the talks, and will particular emphasis be put on them?

[Zolotarevskiy] Aleksey Stanislavovich, perhaps you...

[Yeliseyev] Well, I agree completely with Mrs Kassebaum that this is a very important meeting, and a first step will be taken toward true disarmament. We believe that questions regarding the destruction of long-range missiles will be raised at this meeting in order to reduce the danger of an outbreak of war. We are in favor of reducing the level of armaments—of conventional armaments, too—and in this connection I would like, firstly, to express the hope that the meeting will be held against a good background and that our dialogue will serve the interests of establishing such a fine tone. I have a follow-up question for you: Tell me, what do you think, will the treaty be ratified in the United States of America after the meeting, the treaty on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles?

[Kassebaum] Yes, I think this proposal will be supported. But another question, the question of verification [proverka] has to be settled. This is a very important question, and at the talks this question has still not been fully resolved. I think that if this question is resolved...

[Jennings interrupts] Senator Kassebaum, can you explain, please, what are the complications connected with verification, so that the Soviet viewers may understand this.

[Kassebaum] I think that today or tomorrow the question will be finally settled, positions on the question of verification will be adopted. There will be different parameters and many other circumstances.

[Jennings] Senator Bradley?

[Bradley] Can you destroy all nuclear weapons, or one class of weapon? You first want to make sure that this class of weapon will really be destroyed. This is connected with certain measures of control [kontrol]. It would be useful if our Soviet friends understood that the U.S. Senate is one of bodies of legislative power which will examine the treaty, proceeding from what it contains. Senator Kassebaum said that we hope—we expect—that the treaty will be ratified. We hope that this will, at the same time, be merely the start and not the end. We hope that for the Soviet Union, too, this will not be the end of everything. We hope that we will move on to a reduction in strategic offensive armaments—and this is no less important—we will be able to arrive at a reduction in conventional arms in Central Europe. It is precisely in Central Europe, as you know, that there is the most serious imbalance and the most serious reductions should be applied. Here we clash with one another directly. As General Secretary Gorbachev said on the subject, the American people know about it. We want to remove the danger of a sudden attack, to eliminate the imbalance; that is why believe that some progress in reducing conventional weapons in Central Europe would be a very important factor to prove that the general secretary is serious when [passage indistinct]

[Jennings] With us in Washington today is chairman of one of the Congress committees. What do you think, congressman, do you agree with what Senator Bradley said, that the American people, members of the Congress and senators believe that the problem of inequality, the lack of balance, can be resolved?

[Unidentified congressman] That is a serious question. I would like to address our participants on the Soviet side in an attempt to develop on what Bradley said concerning conventional weapons. All objective observers view the balance of forces in wars...[corrects himself] in the following way: It is believed that the Warsaw Pact countries possess a significant advantage in the field of conventional weapons. That is why a greater reduction of conventional weapons is expected from the Warsaw Pact countries in comparison with what is expected from the Western side, and that is why an agreement on reducing conventional forces should envisage a greater cut from the viewpoint of the Warsaw Pact countries.

[Primakov] I would like to comment, if possible, on these pronouncements. First and foremost, I would like to say that I fully agree with what has been said here on the need for continuity of the process. It is precisely what we insist upon. Naturally, if the two varieties of weapons are eliminated it will be very significant, it will be what Americans call a breakthrough [previous word in English] a real breakthrough can take place.

That is because very, very high-quality weapons, so to speak, are to be scrapped. But one needs to go further. Naturally, one should include here the issues of strategic offensive weapons and their reduction by 50%—this is a rife and very important problem—but one should also pursue the line of cuts in conventional weapons. Here Congressman (Esmin) is right, of course. I cannot agree, of course—and there are many in the West who do not agree with the conclusions concerning a vast superiority of the Warsaw Pact in conventional weapons—French experts do not agree, and also, on the qualitative questions, a different point of view was also voiced by experts of the London Institute of Strategic Studies, and so on.

But here, Mr Congressman, it seems to me that two aspects of our position should be taken into account: First, we are in favor of eliminating the disbalance, those gumboils that exist. For example, you believe that we have an advantage in tanks. One can argue or not argue about it, because there are outdated models in the composition of our tank units, etc., but let's talk. You believe that there is a superiority. We believe that you have a superiority—and that is really so—in strike aicraft. There is a superiority in helicopter gunships. Let us give that thing up on both sides: That is our position. Then, another very important point concerning conventional weapons. It is the following: We want the cuts and the confidence-building measures that are being implemented to be carried out in a way that would exclude a sudden attack, the possibility of a sudden attack. That is where the proposals on corridors come from, where many other proposals come from: on corridors free from nuclear weapons, from offensive weapons, etc. Support that point of view. I believe that that is the basis for a constructive conversation, and we are waiting for such constructive conversation.

[Jennings] Mr Primakov, I am sorry we have to interrupt you, but we would like to continue the discussion in a minute. Now, commercials. [passage omitted]

[Zolotarevskiy] Peter, we have already discussed a number of very important subjects...

[Jennings interrupts] Leonid, can I just at the start say a couple of things...

[Zolotarevskiy interrupts] Just a moment Peter, you handed over to me and I started to speak. Then you can have your say. So, we have already discussed a number of important subjects which concern to an equal degree both the American and Soviet people, and probably people all over the world. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that, while it is beyond the bounds of our discussion, there remains such a complex and explosive region as the region of the Persian Gulf and the Near East. I believe that among our deputies there are specialists on this question from whom we will probably hear much that is interesting. I would like to ask Deputy Primakov to speak on this subject.

[Primakov] Well, I don't know, silence means agreement, is that so? Indeed, on the Persian Gulf, it must be said that the situation there is very complex. It seems to me there are complications. It is complex because an unending war is taking place between Iraq and Iran. We have been against this war from the very beginning. This situation is complex because the Persian Gulf is literally swarming with naval forces or warships—mostly U.S. or their allies'. We are suggesting a way out. We are suggesting...[pause] we are indeed concerned for the freedom of shipping, and we believe that many countries have the right of freedom—indeed, the whole world has the right—of freedom of shipping. But let us ensure this freedom of shipping, for example, by the naval forces which have been operating under the UN flag. Why is the United States against this?

[Jennings] Senator Bradley or Senator Kassebaum?

[Kassebaum] I am responsible to the legislative assembly for these questions. There is a problem here. I believe that our common goal is to ensure the freedom and safe passage of ships. There are various ways of deescalating the conflict, and on the other hand there are different ways for joint actions with the United Nations. We are having discussions with the United Nations, and we proposed there an embargo against Iran. A very great many supported it in the Security Council, except you, incidentally. We intend to do this.

[Jennings] Mr Primakov, why does the Soviet Union not wish to support the second UN resolution on an embargo on arms supplies?

[Primakov] Peter, first of all I would very much like you to become a congressman or a senator, because you are asking me questions on behalf of congressmen or senators. I would support your choice if you are eventually elected to the U.S. Congress. [laughter] But I must say—-

[Bradley interrupts] He's making too much money even without that! [laughter]

[Primakov] I would like to answer your question in the following way, without even waiting for an answer to mine, because, after all, once again we are having a discussion without answers. Well, OK, this time I'll agree to answer without having received an answer to my own question. We acted together with you, the United States, in supporting Resolution No 598, which was passed by the Security Council, and I consider that was a tremendous achievement because it was unanimously adopted. You and we displayed firm will, insistence if you like. It was adopted, and this resolution has to operate, it has to work. Now, at the present time, contacts are envisaged between the UN secretary general and representatives of Iran and Iraq. So why should we adopt some other resolution now? Let's give the first one the maximum opportunity to take effect, the first one, and then, if it loses credibility and ends in a total fiasco, then let's think about some other measures. That's logical.

[Yeliseyev] I'd like to make a very short comment on that. If we impose an embargo against Iran, we put one of the two countries in an unequal position. This could lead to an exacerbation of the conflict. Then again, you know that there exists a black market in weapons, there are private firms which sell weapons, so we are not imposing a real embargo on the influx of weapons, this can only exacerbate the situation still further. Let us operate by diplomatic methods.

[Primakov] By the way, you see how restrained we are here, we Supreme Soviet deputies. In discussing this matter, we are not stirring it up about Irangate. We don't want to touch on that at all.

[Jennings] Senator Kassebaum.

[Kassebaum] I think that we have resolutely supported this diplomatic initiative. I have already said that there was a discussion in the United Nations and all these things were discussed. We have tried very hard to maintain peace in that region. I think we share the same goals. [past tense as heard] [passage omitted: commercial break]

[Jennings] Remember that in the second broadcast in our series we spoke about human rights. We know that in the near future, when Gorbachev and Reagan meet, this issue will no doubt once again be touched upon. Congressman Hoyer.

[Hoyer] Let's go back to your question about ratification in the U.S. Congress, of the forthcoming treaty. I think, for example, there is a whole series of documents that the Soviet Union has not implemented; for instance, in 1948 the general declaration of human rights was adopted. It says that anyone can leave their country and return to their country. In 1975 we ratified the Helsinki Final Act. The latest poll shows that 73% of Soviet citizens believe that their fellow citizens should have the right to leave the country and [word indistinct]. In the last program Mr Zagladin said that this does happen, but we know that this is not always observed, and therefore I would like to stress that this has an influence on relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, and this can have an influence on Congress' decision regarding the medium-range missile treaty. We know that 70% of the population of the Soviet Union think that it essential to permit such emigration. What is your view on this? If they want to leave, can they?

[Zolotarevskiy] Peter, I think that Congressman Hoyer's rejoinder and question develop the subject you suggested, that is, finding areas of cooperation, so it is a bit difficult for me. Perhaps Deputy Sukharev, the minister of justice, who is in the studio, can help us, and at the same time answer Congressman Hoyer's question. Please.

[Jennings] Leonid, you like to play by a set of rules; when a question is asked, you have to answer it. I hope that Mr Sukharev will answer the congressman's question.

[Zolotarevskiy] Of course, of course, we are playing exactly to those rules.

[Sukharev] First I listened to the conclusions made by the senators in respect of sociological research, moreover, research in which they refer to our Soviet citizens. I would like to answer the question like this: Apart from the 1948 declaration to which you refer, which we esteem and observe, there are pacts on civil and political rights, about socioeconomic rights, which we ratified and implement, and which, unfortunately, the United States has not yet ratified and which are also an impediment, to a certain extent, to cooperation. But I would like to say that the steps that have been taken of late by our government, and those changes which we have in our legislation and in practice—of which the United States is also taking note, incidentally—are evidence that those problems of stratification which we once had in this field are now being eliminated.

The gentlemen are well aware of this. In this connection I would like to say just one thing: We, in our latest debates, in the course of virtually just 1 year, have passed two acts of legislation to resolve these issues, directed toward international cooperation. We have proposed to convene—in Moscow, or in any other place, as wished by our U.S. partners—an international conference on the whole range of humanitarian cooperation. Unfortunately, as yet we have had no positive response on these matters. But I would like to make use of this, and say: U.S. congressmen, we still need to take up more constructive, I would say, partner-like positions. Indeed, we Soviet people and the congressmen and ordinary people have a mass of questions about the problems existing in the United States, about human rights problems. When we get to that point of view—and these problems are expressed by lawyers and by many Americans, they are problems pertaining to violation of human rights and to political prisoners and a number of other problems—if we take up these partner-like positions we will of course find mutual understanding, we will arrive at international cooperation. This is what I would like to call upon everyone to achieve.

[Zolotarevskiy] Peter, apart from that, I should like to remind you of something else. During the last telebridge, Deputy Zagladin made a quite specific proposal to the U.S. Congress. He proposed the creation of a joint group of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Congress to consider all matters in dispute, to consider all the specific matters of interest to one side or the other. No reply has been received to this proposal, nor indeed, I should like to say, to even one of the constructive proposals which were made in the course of the first and second telebridges. I would like Congressman Hoyer, who was one of the main speakers on the last occasion, to reply to the proposal from Congressman Zagladin—I beg his pardon, Deputy Zagladin—even if it is rather late.

[Hoyer] I think the proposal that Deputy Zagladin made is a very positive one and I do not doubt, Leonid, that through our Helsinki commission and our majority leader in the Senate, we will undoubtedly discuss this question. However, the aim of my question about emigration was the following: In our declaration we call for specific actions, that is, permission for emigration. This is naturally a very important question for the United States, as Mr Zagladin said. So I ask: Can Soviet citizens who want to leave for other countries be permitted to do so?

[Jennings] Do you have an answer to that question?

[Hoyer] The point is that those permissions which you grant are not always immediately made known. The point is that in the United States we consider that those rules of which you speak restrict emigration rather than permit it. Therefore we are continually hearing of various other restrictions of the type concerning relations between families, or the presence of members of a family. In the Declaration of Human Rights it says that there should be no such restrictions. We believe in human rights, and therefore we consider that every country, including our own, should abide by these documents and grant its citizens this right accordingly. It is this which influences our impression of the Soviet Union. We consider that subsequent documents which may be signed, such as the document on medium-range missiles, must naturally somehow be linked with those earlier questions which are touched on in those documents.

[Jennings] I would like to warn our associates in ABC that we will overrun the time allocated to us to some extent, by a few minutes. Senator Bradley, do you want to talk about cooperation?

[Zolotarevskiy] Excuse me, Peter, a question was asked, and I believe we should answer it. Deputy Yeliseyev, please.

[Yeliseyev] I would like to say a couple of words. Firstly, I am very surprised by the question, because this question has already been answered several times. There are no obstacles to departure from the Soviet Union, except in those cases when it could be against the interests of the state.

[Primakov] For uniting families?

[Yeliseyev] For uniting families, yes. Certainly you in Congress do not know about every case. We don't know about every case either, because these are usually not matters of state, they are matters of individual families. Then we returned to questions of human rights. You keep on about one very specific question of human rights; there is a whole range of these rights. We know, for instance, that you recently passed a law under which people from Central America living in the United States have to leave the United States. This law contradicts human rights. It seems to me that this is a range of questions which ought to be discussed together; you are raising one very particular one.

[Zolotarevskiy] You know, Aleksey Stanislavovich, it seems to me that there is another aspect of the question here; it also concerns the question of why the question of disarmament should be linked with other questions.

[Jennings] Senator Bradley, perhaps you'd like to express your opinion. Why are Americans...

[Zolotarevskiy interrupts] Perhaps Deputy Primakov would like to comment on this question of linkage.

[Primakov] Let the senator speak first, it's OK by me.

[Bradley] It seems to me that Congressman Hoyer's question boiled down to this: Will there be free emigration from the Soviet Union? I am not talking about modifications to certain rules and standards which exist in this field in the Soviet Union, but I was told, as I heard it, that yes, this will indeed take place. In that case, we should at least return to the level that existed in the seventies, 4,000 people a year. The norms have changed, but what is happening in the human rights field has to be checked practically. If something is an obstacle to solving this question, the legislative norms ought to be changed.

Changing our topic somewhat, I think that it is very, very important to focus our attention not only on what divides us—since a great deal divides the Soviet Union and the United States, for historical reasons, because of their differing value systems and for other reasons—there are also areas where we can cooperate. When we met in New York, Deputy Primakov said that we can cooperate in the environmental sphere. I think that we should indeed do that. The area of cutting conventional weapons in Europe is a very important one. But it is possible to do something else; we need a symbol, a symbol of what is possible, opening up under the new relations. I propose the following: It would be a really bright symbol if the Soviet Union and the United States, while protecting their military secrets, of course, were to embark upon a joint program for sending men to Mars by the 100th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. That would be a really outstanding proposal that could really aid our relations.

[Yeliseyev] I would applaud that proposal. Thank you very much. We remember the fine work done on the "Soyuz"-"Apollo" program. Work to prepare an expedition to Mars would be even more impressive and would work to the benefit of our cooperation on the most diverse levels. Thank you for such a good proposal.

[Primakov] I would very much like to emphasize our gratitude for timing this for the 100th anniversary of Great October because we would have to wait longer for the 300th anniversary of the United States! Let's cut down the distance.

[Jennings] We should close our program with applause.

[Zolotarevskiy] Peter, the fact is that we have in the studio Deputy Basov, the world-famous scientist, an academician and Nobel prize winner, who could probably outline for us a more precise prospect for this kind of joint journey.

[Basov] I think that the issue that has been raised, of cooperation in complex fields such as interplanetary travel, is extremely important, and I think that we could find ways here for reciprocal cooperation, like that which we have in the complex field in which I am now working, laser thermonuclear synthesis, where we meet our U.S. colleagues and agree on a great deal. I hope that in May next year we will have a successful seminar on the development of drivers for laser thermonuclear synthesis.

While I'm at the microphone I would like to clarify for myself, so to speak, one issue. I don't really understand, when we discuss the matter...[pauses] well, we discuss today's hotspots for mankind, and it seems that the transfer of weapons into space is among those hotspots. When one starts to discuss SDI, specifically, we know how expensive this program is, and whether it should work or not is not certain. At the same time, its cost is comparable to creating eternal thermonuclear power for countries the size of the Soviet Union or the United States. So I don't really understand—I know the official point of view on this matter, and this is always somehow linked, and I don't know if it is to be discussed at the summit—but what is the attitude of congressmen to this. How do they explain to their electorate that this budget, equal to thousands of normal ones, so to speak, must be spent every year on solving such a dubious problem? Thank you for your attention.

[Zolotarevskiy] Well, Peter, if the father of the laser considers this problem to be dubious, (?how do you explain it)?

[Jennings] Senator Kassebaum, what is your explanation when you talk to your electorate?

[Kassebaum] We are asked this question. In Kansas, for example, I was asked how we will test the U.S. defensive missile systems, and how will the Soviet Union and the United States do these tests? I think that we are obliged to recognize that we are striving for the defensive nature of our concept, whatever system it is, the Star Wars system, we are obliged to outline the picture at the present stage, we are acting within the framework of the ABM Treaty. [sentence as heard] I think that when you do the same we will overstep a certain barrier, and then we will have to conduct this discussion.

[Jennings] Some of your voters live near missile sites, with the missiles pointed to hit certain targets within the Soviet Union. Do they support their side, or are they against?

[Kassebaum] It is a complicated business. When you make a speech in a town there is a great variety of opinions. There are people who indeed support this armaments program, and there are people who are sharply critical of it. When you turn to the technical aspects of the program, all of its complexity emerges. A further point I want to add: I believe that a small step is needed to assist our understanding of each other in the field of defense. We should openly debate military budgets. I think that this should be done by both us and you. Your military budget is a closed business. We do not have an adequate understanding of it. We don't know where the money goes, the actual sums, what prospects are set forth. We need to have a clearer idea of such points.

[Jennings] Do you have a final comment? It will soon be time to say goodbye.

[Primakov] I only want to say that I liked the present comment by Senator Kassebaum very much. I believe that the principal things lies in adhering to the ABM Treaty in the same context in which we signed it, and not in some sort of an expanded interpretation. Then we both are going to be calm. As far as talking openly on military budgets is concerned, we are also in favor of that, and a lot is being done in the Soviet Union at the moment in order to disclose military budgets, and their articles are to be explained. That is absolutely clear. It has already been stated. When we shift to the price reform, new prices, military appropriations will be comparable, and we will be able to speak completely openly about it. I think that we will have a vast field for joint discussions on this subject. I want to support the constructive nature of Senator Kasselbaum's proposal and to thank her for it.

[Zolotarevskiy] I think we have approached the end of this program on a good note. A certain degree of mutual understanding has been reached, a certain degree of agreement, the chief thing perhaps being the fact that we should conduct a constructive dialogue that aims not at endlessly repeating what separates us, but at finding points which unite us or can unite us. I would like to complete this dialogue and this series of television bridges between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Congress on this optimistic note, and to express the hope that these dialogues have brought a positive contribution to the cause of better understanding between our countries, between our peoples, between our legislators, and that all taken together will be instrumental in creating the good businesslike atmosphere in which, as we hope, the meeting of the leaders of our countries will pass.

[Jennings] Thank you very much, Leonid, for taking part in this program...[voice faded out, video cuts from studio to still picture of Moscow]

China

CPC Aide on SDI, Taiwan, Japan Trade

PM191155 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 19 Nov 87 p 3

[TASS report: "At a Meeting in Beijing. Statement by the Chief of the CPC Central Committee International Liaison Department"]

[Text] Tokyo, 18 Nov—An *Asahi* correspondent reports from Beijing that in the course of a meeting between Zhu Liang, chief of the CPC Central Committee International Liaison Department, and T. Doi, chairman of the Japanese Socialist Party Central Executive Committee, held in the Chinese capital, the CPC representative condemned the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" program. He stated that the PRC "opposes the spread of the nuclear arms race into space."

Zhu Liang raised the question of the student hostel in the city of Kyoto, which a Japanese court has pronounced to be the property of Taiwan. In this connection he stressed that "Japan's ties with Taiwan are being strengthened."

The chief of the CPC Central Committee International Liaison Department also touched on the problem of the imbalance in Chinese-Japanese trade, indicating the growth of China's deficit in commodity turnover with Japan and called upon the Japanese side to rectify the situation.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Delegation Leaves for New Zealand, Australia

PM181623 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Interparliamentary Ties"]

[Text] A group of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies led by R.N. Nishanov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, left Moscow 15 November for Australia and New Zealand for meetings and talks with these countries' political and parliamentary figures. The group comprises deputies A.S. Isayev and F.E. Musayev.

The deputies were seen off at the airport by G. Pallayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; E.L. Kuzmin, chief of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium International Relations Department; and other officials.

Meets Australia's Hayden

LD182026 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT 18 Nov 87

[Text] Canberra November 18 TASS—A group of Soviet MP's led by Rafik Nishanov, a vice-president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet (Parliament) of the USSR, have begun a visit to Australia.

They met today with William Hayden, Australian minister for foreign affairs and trade, and briefed him upon the processes of change under way in the USSR.

Hayden hailed the positive processes taking place in the Soviet Union.

Much attention was paid to foreign policy problems. The Soviet parliamentarians stressed the peaceful nature of the foreign policy of the USSR and spoke about their country's efforts for bringing about disarmament and removing the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

Note was taken of the importance of the forthcoming summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

The Australian minister supported the Soviet Union's foreign policy initiatives in the Asian-Pacific region made by the Gorbachev in Vladivostok and in the interview with the Indonesian newspaper *Merdeka.*

Hayden expressed the hope for the further development of fruitful cooperation between the two countries in most diverse fields, including trade, culture, science and sports.

Received by Hawke

LD192007 Moscow TASS in English 1445 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] Canberra November 19 TASS—A visit to Australia of a group of deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by Rafik Nishanov, deputy president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, is going on.

Soviet parliamentarians were received today by Prime Minister Robert Hawke of Australia. They told the Australian leader about celebrations in Moscow on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and about a report made by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The deputies pointed out that participants in the meeting of representatives of parties and movements had been deeply impressed by a speech delivered by Senator Michael Beahan, national vice-president of the Australian Labour Party.

They called the attention of Robert Hawke to the coming Soviet-American summit meeting and the efforts exerted by the Soviet Union and the United States in the sphere of disarmament. The head of the Australian Government welcomed in this connection the Soviet-American agreement on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles.

The Australian prime minister emphasized that his coming visit to the Soviet Union would take place at a remarkable time. The Australian Government is closely following the progress of perestroyka (restructuring) in the Soviet Union and the establishment of a new political thinking both on the internal and international levels.

Hawke voiced his country's interest in a further development of bilateral relations with the USSR in trade, economy, science and culture on the basis of the existing agreements, as well as new agreements that could be reached in the future.

The group of deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet visited today the Federal Parliament of Australia, attended sessions of the Senate and the House of Representatives and met with heads of both chambers and with a number of ministers.

The Soviet parliamentarians took part in a special session of the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defense. A broad and fruitful exchange of opinions on problems of foreign policy, humanitarian issues and the development of economic and trade relations between the USSR and Australia took place there.

New Ambassador to Philippines Appointed

LD141331 Moscow TASS in English 1127 GMT 14 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS—Oleg Sokolov has been appointed ambassador of the USSR in the Republic of the Philippines by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet relieved Vadim Shabalin, who was given another post, of his duties of the USSR ambassador in the Republic of the Philippines.

Oleg Sokolov, born in 1937, has been in the diplomatic service since 1960. He was minister-counselor of the USSR Embassy in the United States from 1981 to 1987.

USSR, Vietnam Sign 1988 Trade Protocol

LD171703 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 17 Nov 87

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] A protocol was signed in Moscow today on trade turnover and payments between the Soviet Union and Vietnam for 1988. The document was signed by Kozhin, deputy USSR minister of foreign trade, and Hoang Trong Dai, deputy minister of foreign trade of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. It is envisaged that goods such as machinery, equipment, petroleum products, rolled ferrous metals, cotton, and consumer goods, which are highly important to the SRV's economy, will be supplied to Vietnam.

In turn, Vietnam will supply the Soviet Union with natural rubber, tin, coffee, tea, fruits and vegetables, and a number of other commodities. The protocol also covers reciprocal deliveries of goods within the context of comprehensive special-purpose cooperation programs.

USSR, Cambodia Sign 1988 Trade Agreement

LD171728 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 17 Nov 87

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] A protocol was signed in Moscow today on trade turnover and payments between the Soviet Union and Kampuchea for 1988. The protocol was signed by Aristov, USSR minister of foreign trade, and Ho Non, minister of trade of the People's Republic of Kampuchea [name and title as heard]. The document provides for continuing deliveries to Kampuchea of machinery, equipment, various materials, motor vehicle and tractor equipment, and mineral fertilizers essential for the development of the national economy of the friendly country. Kampuchea will deliver to our country its traditional export goods.

Near East & South Asia

Ryzhkov Departs 19 Nov for Visit to India

PM201117 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "On an Official Visit"]

[Text] N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, left Moscow for Delhi 19 November on an official friendly visit at the invitation of Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and the Indian Government. He will participate in the opening ceremony of the USSR Festival in India.

He was seen off at Vnukovo Airport by L. N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom; L. A. Voronin, Yu. D. Maslyukov, and I. S. Silayev, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers; M. S. Smirtyukov, administrator of the USSR Council of Ministers; B. I. Aristov, V. M. Velichko, V. A. Dinkov, S. V. Kolpakov, and A. I. Mayorets, USSR ministers; B. Ye. Panyukov, USSR first deputy minister; and other officials.

The send-off party included P.K. Budkhvar [name as transliterated], Indian charge d'affaires ad interim in the USSR.

Departing with the Soviet head of government were the officials accompanying him: V. M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; K. F. Katushev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations; and Yu. M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister.

Stops in Tashkent En Route

LD192208 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Nov 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] On his way to Delhi, Comrade Ryzhkov made a stopover in Tashkent. He was met at the airport by Comrade Usmankhodzhayev and other republic leaders.

Arrives in New Delhi 20 Nov

LD200604 Moscow TASS in English 0601 GMT 20 Nov 87

[Text] New Delhi November 20 TASS—Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, today arrived in India for an official friendly visit at the invitation of Prime Minister of the Republic Rajiv Gandhi and the Indian Government. He will attend the opening ceremony of the USSR's festival in India. At Delhi Airport Nikolay Ryzhkov was met by Rajiv Gandhi.

Dobrynin Sees Indian Communications Minister

PM191632 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] On 18 November A. F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received Arjun Singh, Indian minister of communications, who is in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology.

During the conversation certain questions of Soviet-Indian relations and the international situation were touched on. Satisfaction was expressed with the dynamic development of multifaceted cooperation between the two countries. The participants in the meeting stressed the great significance of the forthcoming opening of a USSR festival in India devoted to the 70th anniversary of Great October, and noted the successful holding of an India festival in the Soviet Union.

The conversation took place in a warm, friendly atmosphere.

Pyadyshev on Gulf Situation, Arms to Tehran

LD191358 Kuwait KUNA in English 1105 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] Kuwait, Nov 19 (KUNA)—A senior Soviet official was quoted here today as saying that the mission of the U.N. secretary general to implement Security Council Resolution 598 has not been exhausted, stressing that Moscow had exerted considerable efforts in issuance of the resolution.

In an interview with local daily *Al-Watan*, official spokesman of Soviet Foreign Ministry Boris Pyadyshev described the situation in the Gulf as "very tense" due to the war and the increasing U.S. military presence in the region.

He described reports about "frigid" Iraqi-Soviet relations as baseless, noting that the Soviet Union will remain the loyal friend to the Arab people and states.

Pyadyshev admitted his country's political dialogue and economic relations with Iran, but highlighted that such relations will never be at the expense of Moscow's ties with Arab states.

Denying recent media reports about Moscow's supply of arms to Tehran, the Soviet official said the Soviet Union has not provided Iran with even a single bullet.

Pyadyshev, reiterating his country's support to the international conference on the Mideast, noted that Moscow's establishment of relations with Israel is subject to the outcome of the international conference.

Anishchev Led Delegation Returns From Beirut

PM191626 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Return to Moscow"]

[Text] A CPSU delegation headed by V.P. Anishchev, member ofthe CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, returned to Moscow from Beirut 18 November. At the invitation of the Lebanese Communist Party leadership, the delegation took part in events to mark the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Amman Summit One of Reconciliation, Accord

JN191754 Amman AL-RA'Y in Arabic 19 Nov 87 p 19

[By Novosti correspondent in Amman Vladimir Kedrov]

[Text] The Arab world waited a long time for this event. Optimism replaced pessimism, and reservation alternated with enthusiasm. The following questions were the focus of all discussions in political and press circles in Amman during the past weeks: Will the huge efforts the Jordanian leadership exerted to convene the Arab summit conference in Amman be successful? Will King Husayn's several tours to Arab countries yield results?

The lack of confidence demonstrated by the Arab political and press circles in the summit's success and the failure of some states' leaders to attend the summit on various pretexts are generally reflective of the situation that has prevailed in the Arab world for a long time—in the state of disintegration and fragmentation, in the lack of capabilities, and in the absence of the desire to settle inter-Arab differences and crystallize stands acceptable to everyone regarding problems facing the Arab states. These problems are serious and long-term. Leaving them unsolved jeopardizes the Arab states' differences, expands the differences within the Arab world, and snowballs into new problems that are equally serious. Since 1982, when the last Arab summit was held, there has been no serious progress toward settling the Arab-Israeli dispute, which is the Middle East's major issue. Moroever, the Lebanon crisis continues with no end in sight. The Iraq-Iran war continues to set new records of expansion and futility, while militry activity escalates in the Gulf.

Arab League Secretry General Chedli Klibi received the Soviet Foreign Ministry statement on the convocation of the summit on the eve of the summit's opening. The Soviet leadership expressed in this statement its support for the conference and urged the participants to unify the Arab countries' efforts to solve the major and imperious problems facing the Arabs.

King Husayn of Jordan termed the summit the summit of reconciliation and accord. The Jordanian papers and news agencies carried this term as the official slogan of the Amman meeting.

During the conference, great attention focused on the meeting between Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad and Iraqi President Saddam Husayn. Observers regarded this meeting as a step contributing to attaining positive results.

As for the major issue in the agenda—the Arab-Israeli dispute—the Arab states' leaders announced that peace cannot be achieved in the Middle East without the restoration of the occupied Arab territories including Jerusalem and the restoration of the Arab Palestinian people's national rights. They also announced that the only reasonable method to settle the dispute is a UN-sponsored international conference with the participation of all the sides concerned including the PLO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and the five permanent UN Security Council member countries.

The conferees also expressed concern over the continuation of the Iraq-Iran war and the situation in the Gulf. They announced their solidarity with Iraq and support for Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. They also condemned Iran, which occupies some Iraqi territory, and called for the implementation of all the articles of UN Security Council Resolution No 598.

The final communique reflected the Arab countries' desire to preserve Lebanon's national unity and sovereignty.

The Amman summit condemned all forms of international terrorism and expressed support for the peoples' just struggle for freedom, independence, and national sovereignty.

The Arab leaders agreed that resumption of diplomatic relations with Egypt is an internal affair of every Arab country and that every country can tackle this issue in accordance with its constitution and rules.

The Amman summit also drew the broad lines for solving all major issues. It announced that Arab solidarity is the key to attaining goals. It referred to the methods to reinforce Arab unity and to the prevailing belief that the outcome of the summit gives rise to optimism. Time will reveal how factual the hopes pinned on the Arab summit conference are.

East Europe

Gorbachev, Strougal Discuss Economic Reform

AU191236 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 17 Nov 87 p 1

[CTK report: "Lubomir Strougal Concludes His Working Visit in the USSR; New Possibilities for Deepening Cooperation"]

[Text] Moscow (CTK)—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received Lubomir Strougal, member of the Presidium of the CPCZ Central Committee and CSSR premier, in Moscow yesterday [16 November].

In a cordial and comradely talk, the two representatives expressed satisfaction with the fruitful development of Soviet-Czechoslovak economic cooperation. At the same time they stressed that the untapped resources of integration, which exists in the two countries' production and scientific-technical potentials make it possible resolve bigger tasks and substantially raise the level of rational division of labor between the two countries.

M. Gorbachev welcomed the bilateral decision to perfect forms of cooperation, assert direct production and scientific-technical relations among enterprises, institutes, and associations, see to a better technical standard and quality of mutual deliveries and thus dynamize the volume and the pace of future cooperation.

The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee spoke about the CPSU's activity in the realization of restructuring, which will reveal the advantages and potential possibilities of socialism. The elaboration of strategic solutions acquires immense importance in these crucial stages of social development. However, it is not enough just to work out the necessary line. It is no less important to imprint it in the consciousness of the masses. And this is precisely how the CPSU proceeds. The party ensures the creation of the necessary political, organizational, and ideological conditions for the successful realization of restructuring. Its attention and efforts are currently concentrating on two mutually interlinked directions of restructuring—on democratization and on radical economic reform. The objective of the democratization of the entire sociopolitical life is that the working people would become active participants when it comes to resolving affairs in the collective, in the state and society, that they would become real masters of their lives.

L. Strougal stressed that Czechoslovakia follows with great interest and sympathy the profound changes that are occurring in the Soviet Union. The CPSU's experience and its determination to achieve a qualitatively new degree of the development of socialism are for Czechoslovak Communists and the working people an example of a creative approach to the realization of the topical tasks of socialist construction. He informed Mikhail Gorbachev about the plans connected with the restructuring of the economic mechanism and expressed the conviction that the adopted measures will make it possible to ensure Czechoslovakia's dynamic course on the path of socialism and in asserting the democratization of society and the party's and state's open policy.

The Czechoslovak premier wished Mikhail Gorbachev much successes in his December talks in Washington, which could become a historical watershed for the improvement of the situation in the world.

M. Gorbachev wished the fraternal Czechoslovak people much success in the fulfillment of tasks connected with the acceleration of social and economic development.

Vorotnikov Interview on Direct Relations

AU191848 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 18 Nov 87 p 1

[Interview with Vitaliy Vorotnikov, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, by Bratislava PRAVDA staff journalists Arnost Bak and Jozef Sedlak: "Let Us Be Bolder Regarding Direct Relations Among Enterprises"—date and place not given]

[Text] In *Pravda* on Monday [16 November] we extensively reported on the visit by the RSFSR Government delegation headed by Vitaliy Vorotnikov to the Pokrok united agricultural cooperative in Ostrov. In a lively discussion, Comrade Vorotnikov took an in some cases almost detailed interest in the results that are being achieved not only in the natural indicators and the post-harvest processing of corn for seed, but, above all, in economics and, especially, in the profitability of animal production. There was also an extensive discussion on the results of the direct relations between the Pokrok united agricultural cooperative in Ostrov and two kolkhozes—the Pobeda and Lenin—in the Saratov Oblast.

After the discussion, our staff journalists asked Comrade Vorotnikov for an interview, in which,in answering their questions, he told them, among other things:

[Bratislava *Pravda*] In the discussion you stressed the conviction about the need to more comprehensively foster the development of direct relations between Czechoslovak and Soviet enterprises. What is your opinion of the possibility or the need to establish more broadly conceived production associations, within the framework of which direct interenterprise relations would develop; for example, of setting up an association of our own and Saratov's corn growers?

[Vorotnikov] First of all, I would once again like to express thanks for the exemplary results which, thanks to the creative development of direct production relations, have been achieved by the Ostrov cooperative and our partner kolkhozes in the Saratov Oblast. This is evidence that there is no need to wait for instructions from above, but—in order to develop direct relations between enterprises—make the use of the possibilities offered by the resolutions of the CSSR and USSR Governments. Regarding the second part of the question, which was also posed in the discussion, I, personally, do not think that there is need to set up any roof or supraenterprise agencies for developing direct relations between enterprises. Let us avoid any centralization, any administrative bodies, or, if you want, any bureaucracy of supraenterprise agencies or international supraenterprise organizations. Yes, cooperation among states, governments, ministries, and branches will develop, but it will be possible to develop this cooperation informally only through developing direct relations among enterprises, among their work collectives. This is the decisive thing if we want, and we both want, to proceed faster toward this goal. This fact is also affirmed by the results of the development of direct relations between the Ostrov and the Saratov cooperative farmers, results which are worth emulating.

[Bratislava *Pravda*] However, their successful development is being prevented by some problems which are not being resolved, for example, as regards setting prices for services we provide each other, or when it comes to the imposition of duties [preclievani] on materials and machinery that move between our enterprises and yours, and other things. Cooperative farmers and kolkhozniks are solving this in their own way, but higher state agencies must provide definite instructions.

[Vorotnikov] We are aware of the price problem, and I can say that we are intensively working to solve it. We will also have to put in order the rights [prava] arising from direct relations between enterprises on border crossings. The problems about which you speak do exist, and I am convinced that they will be resolved for the benefit of both sides and thus stimulate the desirable relations of direct production cooperation between Soviet and Czechoslovak enterprises. The enterprises which are already working on the basis of direct relations serve as an example in many respects.

[Bratislava *Pravda*] As was also heard in the course of the discussion, one should not interfere with instructions from above, but instead should offer advice to help find a common denominator for mutual clearing [vyuctovanie] and development of cooperation.

[Vorotnikov] I agree with Comrade Sedlak, chairman of the Ostrov cooperative, who said that our kolkhozniks always come to an agreement with your cooperative farmers, and vice versa, in such a way that even with the existing price problems, the agreement is advantageous for both sides as well as for society. The results of their work confirm this.

[Bratislava *Pravda*] Many proposals were heard in the discussion on how to accelerate the solution of some problems in the interest of developing direct relations. A very interesting point was the proposal on the possibility within the experiment to create intraenterprise prices which would respect mutual advantage. These prices would be decided by enterprises cooperating on the basis of direct relations without the intervention of the administrative agencies.

[Vorotnikov] I endorse such experiments from the bottom of my heart, and I am convinced that the Ostrov cooperative farmers and the Saratov kolkhozniks could be a model here. I think that this could also be used in a broader concept when, for example, chemists-producers of herbicides would join the ranks of corn growers. Possibilities for this exist, and economic accountability is a good basis. Experience acquired from such an experiment—and not only in agriculture—would certainly help to accelerate the solution of the problem of prices, mutual clearing, and so forth.

[Bratislava *Pravda*] What would you like to say in conclusion?

[Vorotnikov] I would like to thank the Ostrov cooperative farmers as well as our Saratov kolkhozniks for the initiative in developing direct relations between their enterprises, as well as for the remarkable results which they had achieved. I am convinced that next year they will achieve such a harvest not just on 1,000 hectares, but on 10,000 hectares, and that this direct cooperation among enterprises as direct producers will continue to deepen and expand. I would like to say one more thing I believe: that the feat of the Ostrov cooperative farmers and their partners in the Pobeda and Lenin's kolkhozes in the Saratov Oblast will find in our country, as well as in your own, equally dedicated and energetic followers.

Envoy to GDR Meets With W. Berlin Mayor

LD192037 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1852 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] Berlin, 19 Nov (TASS)—A meeting between Vyacheslav Kochemasov, the USSR ambassador to GDR and Eberhard Diepgen, governing mayor of West Berlin, took place in West Berlin today. The questions which represent mutual interest were discussed in the course of discussion.

GDR Official on Progress of Amnesty

PM191113 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent V. Lapskiy report under the rubric "Facts, Events, Opinions": "Work Guaranteed for Those Granted Amnesty"]

[Text] Berlin—GDR General Prosecuting Attorney Guenter Wendland has told press representatives that the amnesty declared just over 1 month ago is being implemented strictly according to schedule.

To date almost 20,000 prisoners have been released before their full sentence has elapsed. Their integration into society has been without incident on the whole. Thanks to thorough preparations before the amnesty and close collaboration between state organs, enterprises, and social organizations, the released prisoners are guaranteed work. Every one of them is being talked to individually.

MSZMP Central Committee Plenum Meets

PM191135 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 87 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "MSZMP Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Budapest, 13 Nov—An information report on a plenum ofthe MSZMP Central Committee held 11 November and chaired by MSZMP General Secretary J. Kadar was published here yesterday. The plenum discussed topical questions of the international situation and Hungary's foreign policy. The MSZMP Central Committee approved a report by the delegation headed by J. Kadar on the Moscow celebrations to mark the Great October's 70th anniversary, the meeting of representatives of parties and movements attending the festivities, and M.S. Gorbachev's conversation with J. Kadar.

The MSZMP Central Committee highly appraises M.S. Gorbachev's report at the gala session in Moscow and its profound analysis of the historical path which has been traveled, as well as the efforts aimed at the fundamental renewal of the Soviet economy and Soviet society, the development of socialist democracy and broad glasnost, and the discovery and use of socialism's reserves. The MSZMP and the Hungarian people follow with particular attention and sympathy the process of restructuring in the Soviet Union. M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with J. Kadar reaffirmed that the CPSU and the MSZMP hold analogous views on basic questions of socialist renewal and the international situation.

The Moscow meeting of representatives of parties and movements was imbued with a sense of responsibility for the cause of peace, security, and social progress.

Analyzing the development of Hungary's ties with the socialist countries, the MSZMP Central Committee noted the importance of the Moscow talks between N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and K. Grosz, chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers. It was pointed out that the talks attested to a mutual desire to improve Soviet-Hungarian cooperation and to solve the tasks facing both countries.

Hungarian Party Officials Visit 16-19 Nov

LD200028 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2233 GMT 19 Nov 87

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] A delegation of Hungarian party workers, led by Lukacs, secretary of the MSZMP Central Committee, was in the Soviet Union from 16-19 November at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee. The friends were studying the CPSU's experience in regard to strengthening the guiding role of the party, extending socialist democracy, and improving party control of restructuring in all spheres of public life.

A conversation took place in the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, in Moscow and Brest oblispolkoms, and at a number of industrial and agricultural enterprises. The delegation of Hungarian party workers was received by Comrade Razumovskiy. Rajnai, the Hungarian ambassador to the USSR, took part in the conversation, which passed in a warm and comradely atmosphere.

BCP Plenum on Decision Implementation

PM191145 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 15 Nov 87 p 3

[TASS report: "BCP Central Committee Plenum Met"]

[Text] Sofia, 14 Nov—A BCP Central Committee plenum has met here. Its participants discussed the report "On Certain Practical Measures and Approaches to the Further Implementation of the Decisions of the BCP Central Committee July (1987) Plenum" delivered by T. Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee, and unanimously approved it. The measures contained in the report are geared to the further deepening of restructuring in all spheres of Bulgaria's social development.

Summing up the results of the discussion, T. Zhivkov dwelt on the participation of the Bulgarian party and state delegation in the celebrations of the 70th anniversary of Great October in Moscow. He noted that the report delivered by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the ceremonial session in the Kremlin contained an in-depth and comprehensive assessment and analysis of the Soviet Union's development and an outline of the tasks and prospects of its further dynamic progress and the renewal of the Soviet society characterized by breadth of Leninist vision and revolutionary courage. The Bulgarian Communists and the entire people ardently approve of and support the transformations which are taking place in the USSR.

The plenum heard a report on the fulfillment of the plan for scientific, technical, social, and economic development of Bulgaria in the current year and on the main indicators of the draft plan for 1988.

The plenum decided to hold the national party conference on 28 January 1988 instead of in December of the current year in order to enable economic, state, and party organs and organizations, Communists, and all the working people to focus their efforts on the successful implementation of the plan for 1987 and the fulfillment of the tasks connected with the drafting of the plan for next year.

West Europe

Gorbachev Sends Condolences on UK Subway Fire

LD201348 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 20 Nov 87

[Text] The Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, has sent a message of condolences to Britain's Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, in connection with the loss of human life in a fire in the London Underground. The fire broke out at King's Cross on Wednesday night. Over 30 people died and scores were badly burned or poisoned by smoke. On behalf of the people and leadership of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev expressed his sincere sympathy with the families of the fire victims.

Aganbegyan Speaks at British News Conference

LD201003 Moscow TASS in English 0818 GMT 20 Nov 87

[Text] London November 20 TASS—At a press conference here, Abel Aganbegyan, member of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences, who is in Britain at the invitation of the British Academy, told those present about the course of transformations being effected in the Soviet Union in the socio-economic sphere.

"The major goal of the measures", the academician said, "is tangibly to raise the living standard of Soviet people".

He explained that it was supposed to achieve that in two principal ways—by means of redistribution of resources from the production sphere into the social one, and resultant of an additional rise in production efficiency through a transition to more stimulating management systems, and as a result of reorganisation and acceleration of the country's technological development.

In answer to journalists' questions, Academician Aganbegyan emphasized that the course towards reorganisation did not at all mean a departure from the principles of socialism worked out by the classics of Marxism-Leninism.

"During the reorganisation process we want to renew the socialist society and to develop those features of socialism and the socialist economy which were worked out by Vladimir Lenin over the last years of his life during the transition to the new economic policy".

"This teaching is applied, however, in conformity with the specific conditions and the state of affairs in our days. This means that the teaching develops during the reorganisation process", he said.

Academician Aganbegyan stressed that the current reorganisation differed from reform attempts made in the Soviet Union earlier by being of comprehensive nature.

"It envisages changing the entire mechanism of management in the country, is not limited to half-measures and—what is the most important thing—is accompanied with a transition to democratisation and self-government of the 'grass roots' and is of profound and revolutionary character", he said.

"Herein is the vitality of perestroyka and an earnest of its success", Academician Aganbegyan emphasized.

Kamentsev Meets Danish Premier, Officials

PM191617 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] While in Denmark on an official visit, V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, was received by Danish Prime Minister P. Schluter. Considerable attention was devoted to examining proposals advanced by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in Murmansk for radically lowering military confrontation and developing cooperation in the north and the Arctic.

V.M. Kamentsev and C. Christensen, minister for the Danish environment and Nordic affairs, signed an intergovernmental agreement on promptly notifying nuclear accidents and exchanging information on nuclear plants.

Talks were held with N. Wilhjelm, Danish industry minister. Then a protocol was signed with the leadership of the "Danyard" association of shipyards to agree the basic commercial terms for ordering four fishery protection ships for the USSR Ministry of the Fish Industry. V.M. Kamentsev met with the leadership of the Danish Industrial Council and with representatives of the country's business circles.

Portuguese President Soares Interviewed

PM201159 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA interview with Portuguese President Mario Soares by own correspondent P. Golub: "Mario Soares: Creating a Climate of Detente"; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] Our own correspondent in Lisbon, P. Golub, asked the Portuguese President Mario Soares to give an interview to *Izvestiya*. It is published below.

Lisbon—[Golub] Mr President, your visit to the Soviet Union will take place at the end of November this year. We know that you personally participated actively in the process of establishing relations between our countries after the April Revolution in 1974 and that you have had occasion to visit our country. How do you assess the present state of relations between the two countries after 13 years, and what, in your opinion, are the possibilities for their development?

[Soares] I have indeed visited the Soviet Union. I was first in your country before the democratic revolution was carried out in our country on 25 April 1974. Soon after the April Revolution I came to the USSR as Portuguese foreign minister. During this visit to your country I had the honor of signing with A. Gromyko, then USSR foreign minister, a series of bilateral documents connected with establishing diplomatic relations between Portugal and the USSR which are still in force. Later I came to the Soviet Union as prime minister to participate in the funeral ceremonies on the occasion of Mr. Yu. Andropov's demise. The present visit to your country will be the fourth.

For various reasons connected with peculiarities in development of internal political processes in Portugal in recent years, relations between our countries did not develop, in my opinion, the way they should have. I hope that the present visit will open a new page in relations between our countries, will permit their complete normalization and will create conditions for their speedy development in the most diverse areas: political, economic, and cultural.

[Golub] Your visit to the Soviet Union, the coming conversations with Soviet leaders, it seems, are an important stage in the development of political dialogue between our countries. What is your opinion of the place which Soviet-Portuguese dialogue occupies in the general European process, and in international affairs as a whole?

[Soares] I am a convinced supporter of developing dialogue between Portugal and the Soviet Union. As you know, Portugal has been a member country of the NATO bloc since the time the organization was founded. Now it is a full member of the EEC. Nonetheless, this is not an obstacle to our country's maintenance of permanent dialogue with the USSR. On the other hand, I would like to stress that during the coming visit to the Soviet Union I shall represent a new young Portugal, not only a country with a strong democratic system, a member country of the European Communities, but a country which is making great efforts to accelerate its own economic development and is counting on, like your country, achieving major qualitative progress in the future. I am convinced that the present visit will have great significance for developing bilateral relations and for strengthening the climate of international detente as a whole. I hope that the visit and the coming talks will create favorable opportunities so that our dialogue will continue and develop at all levels.

[Golub] Many Portuguese entrepreneurs and business people are demonstrating a lively interest in expanding trade and economic and technological cooperation with our country. It is not a secret that the Soviet Union is also in favor of developing such ties. In your opinion, what prospects await us on this path?

[Soares] I think that very good prospects await us on this path. Our delegation consists of representatives from major industrial circles, entrepreneurs representing various spheres of industry and trade which are very interested in expanding economic cooperation with the USSR. Some already have experience of trade relations with the Soviet Union and want to develop them further, including by means of creating joint industrial facilities. The delegation includes representatives from the public sector of the economy, in particular, the president of the IPE [State Investment and Shareholdings] state enterprise. The presidents of the confederation of Portuguese industry and of the confederation of Portuguese trade representing the respective circles in our country will be going to the Soviet Union, for example. In the delegation will be entrepreneurs from the largest economic groups, who are distinguished by their dynamism and who demonstrate a desire to develop relations already in existence and to establish new ties with the Soviet Union in the area of industrial and trade cooperation. I am convinced that the present visit will have great significance in this sense as well.

[Golub] How do the Portuguese assess the process of restructuring in the USSR, and further democratization of Soviet society?

[Soares] I would like to say that the Portuguese are following very attentively, and many with sincere interest, the progress of restructuring in your country. A few days ago, I had the opportunity to read M. Gorbachev's *"Restructuring and the New Thinking for Our Country and the Entire World"* which will be officially launched in Portugal on 20 November. The publishers preparing the book for publication in our country kindly presented me with the proofs.

I think that restructuring is an exceptionally important change in your country's life. I see in it many elements which permit the conclusion that relations of Portugal and the other European countries with the USSR can develop successfully. I would like to note with particular satisfaction the Soviet Union's great efforts in the direction of ensuring peace and efforts which can open entirely new prospects for the entire planet.

[Golub] Allow me, Mr President, to end the interview with a question which concerns millions of people today. Many political figures both in the West and in the East call the accord in principle between the USSR and the United States in relation to elimination of parts of their nuclear arsenals in Europe historic. What do you think of the prospects opening up in this connection for strengthening international peace and security?

[Soares] I am convinced that the agreement which, as expected, will be signed between the USSR and the United States during the coming summit meeting in Washington in December this year will indeed be an historic event. The accord on elimination of a significant part of the two countries' nuclear arsenals will serve as a major new impulse in the process of political detente and in solving our planet's major economic problems, primarily the problems of the "Third World" countries where cardinal questions of survival have not been solved—ensuring food supplies, public health and so on. Strengthening mutual understanding between countries and stopping the arms race would permit the effective solution of these problems. I am convinced that today conditions have already been created to strengthen trust so that truly historic steps can be taken in this direction.

I agree with Mr M. Gorbachev that the development of equipment and technology has reached such a level that opportunities have been created to destroy mankind's very habitat and to destroy our planet. It would be madness if mankind did not succeed in achieving mutual understanding and agree to eliminate arsenals of lethal weapons representing a threat to its own survival.

In conclusion, I would like to thank *Izvestiya* for giving me the opportunity to establish contact with the Soviet people and express confidence that the coming visit to your country will accord with the interests of Portugal and the Soviet Union, and will permit strengthening the climate of international cooperation.

France Tests Nuclear Device at Mururoa Atoll

LD200822 Moscow TASS in English 0810 GMT 20 Nov 87

[Text] London November 20 TASS—France tested a nuclear device at Mururoa Atoll in the Pacific on Thursday.

The 60-kiloton device was three times more powerful than the bomb dropped by the United States on Hiroshima in 1945, *Reuter* news agency reported from Wellington, citing a New Zealand government seismologist.

This was the eighth nuclear test by France, monitored by a New Zealand station in the Cook Islands.

FRG 'Revanchist' Organization Described

LD192013 Moscow TASS in English 1451 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] Bonn November 19 TASS—TASS correspondent Vladimir Serov reports:

The "Union of the Exiled", the leading association of West German revanchist organizations, was created in Hannover 36 years ago. Since that time the organization with a membership that stands today at about two million has come out for the revision of the post-war borders established by the Potsdam agreement, for another reshaping of the political map of Europe.

During the "cold war" years the "Union of the Exiled" openly supported, encouraged and financed by the Bonn government acted as the vanguard of the revanchist forces working for the revival of the "Great German Reich", for the absorption by West Germany of the GDR, the socialist German state, and for the getting back of the lands which are an integral part of Poland, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union.

The objectives of the provocative activities of the "Union of the Exiled" did not change after the signing by the social-liberal coalition government of West Germany of treaties with those socialist countries that consolidated the inviolability of the post-war borders. The methods were the only thing that changed a little. "Those who are eternally in the past" began to better camouflage their aspirations aimed at the revision of the results of World War II and the post-war development with demagogic talk about their allegedly "peaceful" intentions, about their "giving up of the use of force" and "the desire to establish peaceful relations with their neighbours".

The turn to the right proclaimed five years ago by the government of conservatives gave another impetus to the activities of revanchists. Hartmut Koschyk, recently appointed secretary general of the "Union of the Exiled", praises Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl in one of the latest issues of the press bulletin *Deutscher Ostdienst* for mentioning the "open German problem" in his state-of-the-nation report and for asserting that "from the legal point of view the German Reich continued to exist within the 1937 borders".

However, no matter how hard "those who are eternally in the past" camouflage their true intentions, more and more people in West Germany come to realize that their activities are extremely dangerous to peace.

Economic Ties With Turkey, Prospects Viewed

PM191125 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 87 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent A. Stepanov dispatch: "The Fruits of Good-Neighborliness"]

[Text] Ankara, Nov—"First choose your neighbor, then build your house," a Turkish proverb says. However, in the practice of interstate relations, the situation is somewhat different. While the question of what kind of house, i.e. what kind of sociopolitical system is to be built, is decided by the peoples themselves, it is history that makes them into neighbors. The relations between our peoples go back for centuries. Admittedly there have been military conflicts, but there have also been periods of political rapprochement, regular diplomatic contacts, and development of trade.

As for relations of equitable and mutually advantageous cooperation based on mutual respect and noninterference in each other's internal affairs, they were founded by V.I. Lenin and M.K. Ataturk in the early twenties. At that time, the young Soviet state was the first to recognize the republican Turkish Government, and it helped the Turkish people who were fighting for national independence.

We began our trade on a small scale, but even at that time it was free from restrictive quotas and customs barriers. The Soviet-Turkish treaty on trade and navigation, whose 50th anniversary was marked in October this year, has lost none of its topicality since it enshrines the very important principle of most-favored-nation status in the trade between our countries.

In the thirties, the textile combines in Kayseri and Nazilli were built with Soviet assistance. At that time, these were the biggest plants not just in Turkey, but in the whole Near and Middle East. They provided the impetus for development of the Turkish textile industry.

After the conclusion of the intergovernmental agreement in 1967, Soviet-Turkish economic cooperation entered a fundamentally new stage. Its fruits were the metallurgical combine at Iskenderun, the aluminum plant at Seydisehir, the oil refinery at Aliaga near Izmir, and a number of other projects.

However, technical progress and life itself called for new forms and spheres of trade, economic, scientific, and technical partnership. In December 1984 a long-term program for its development over a 10-year period was signed in Ankara. It encompasses ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy, the petrochemical, chemical, gas, electrical equipment, ore mining, power generation, and other industries. The agreement on deliveries of Soviet natural gas to Turkey, which was signed in the same year, opened up great opportunities for cooperation in production and trade. The "blue fuel" from the USSR has now reached Turkish soil.

It must be noted that the Turkish leadership and business circles took a most lively interest in this major deal. This is not surprising since the deliveries of Soviet gas are very advantageous for Turkey. They are also advantageous for us since the Turkish side is paying for the gas in hard currency, or by contract construction work and high-grade goods.

"We attach great importance to development of trade and economic relations with the Soviet Union," Yu. Ozal [name as published], former chairman of the Turkish state planning organization, told me.

Representatives of the Turkish business world, and specifically M. Syuzer [name as published], general secretary of the Turkish Foreign Trade Association, believe that restructuring of the economy under way in the Soviet Union will favor introduction of new forms of cooperation.

A. Alptemucin, minister of finance and customs, expressed the following view in this context: "We are now about to tackle questions such as construction of sociocultural facilities in the Soviet Union by Turkish companies to pay for Soviet gas deliveries. We could also jointly build enterprises in each other's countries on a barter basis. We would also like to collaborate with Soviet organizations in construction of industrial enterprises and infrastructure projects in third countries."

Mutually advantageous trade and economic cooperation forms the living fabric of good-neighborly relations. The experience accumulated in Soviet-Turkish relations convincingly confirms this.

Latin America & Caribbean

Panama's Suarez Says U.S. 'To Murder' Noriega

LD192122 Moscow TASS in English 1511 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] Madrid November 19 TASS—The American Embassy in Panama has worked out a plan to assassinate Gen. Manuel Antonio Noriega, commander-in-chief of Panama's national defence forces, Luis Gaspar Suarez, chairman of the Panamenista Party, has told the Spanish newspaper *La Tarde*.

Gen. Noriega, Suarez observed, enraged the American "hawks" by his opposition to negotiations with the United States on the revision of the Panama Canal treaties. Under the treaties, the U.S. is to hand over the canal to Panama by the year 2000.

In a bid to frustrate these plans, Suarez said, Washington was being engaged in overt interference in Panama's internal affairs. The American mass media launched a malicious campaign of slander against the sovereign nation in an attempt to discredit the Panamanian Government.

American servicemen were involved in street disorders in Panama. To add the economic boycott aimed at destabilizing the country. As to Gen. Noriega, attempts had been first made to intimidate him, then to bribe him. Preparations had been launched now to murder him, Suarez warned.

Soviet Parliamentarians Begin Mexico Visit

PM201231 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Mexico City, 19 Nov—A group of USSR Supreme Soviet delegates [as published] headed by G.S. Tarazevich, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, arrived here Wednesday within the framework of a tour of a number of Latin American countries. At the international airport, the head of the group made a statement for the press.

Fruitful ties and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Mexico have developed in very diverse spheres. They are yielding positive results for both countries. This is evidenced by the established practice of regular exchanges of personal messages between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President M. de la Madrid and by the official visits made by our countries' foreign ministers. These forms of political dialogue and other contacts which help to deepen mutual understanding between our countries stimulate broader international cooperation for the good of the peoples and in the interests of ensuring world peace as an indispensable condition of mankind's socioeconomic progress.

Parliamentary exchanges are one form of cooperation between states. Meetings and talks between Soviet and Mexican parliamentarians are an important channel for developing useful interstate ties. We rate highly, in particular, results of visits to the USSR by a delegation of young parliamentarians in May and a delegation of the Mexican National Congress in July of this year.

At all stages of its heroic history, Mexico has firmly and unswervingly implemented universally recognized norms of international law. Mexico's stance in favor of a political solution to disputatious problems and strict observance of the peoples' right to self-determination and of the principles of noninterference in other states' internal affairs and respect for their sovereignty has always met with the understanding and approval of all people of goodwill.

Our country's parliamentarians are confident that Soviet-Mexican relations have good prospects. We hope that they will continue to develop positively in the interests of our countries' peoples and world peace.

At the subsequent press conference G.S. Tarazevich answered numerous questions from Mexican journalists concerning, in the main, processes of restructuring in the USSR.

In addition to Mexico, the group of USSR Supreme Soviet delegates will visit Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Venezuela.

On Wednesday, Mexican President M. de la Madrid received G.S. Tarazevich, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, who is here at the head of a group of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies. Detailed talks were held, during which some urgent questions of the contemporary international situation and also prospects for development of Soviet-Mexican relations were examined in detail.

The president's attention was drawn to the basic propositions of the book *"Restructuring and New Thinking for Our Country and for the Whole World"* by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He was familiarized with the course of the process of revolutionary transformations in the USSR and with Soviet foreign policy initiatives.

RSFSR Presidium Chairman Orlov Visits Cuba

PM201229 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] V.P. Orlov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, left Moscow for Havana 19 November at the invitation of the National People's Government Assembl of the Republic of Cuba.

U.S. 'Blocking Efforts' at Central American Peace

LD192242 Moscow TASS in English 1739 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 19 TASS—TASS commentator Sergey Staroselskiy writes:

On November 21, 1983 President of the United States Ronald Reagan signed a secret directive on appropriating funds for the mining of Nicaraguan ports. This became known much later, but since the beginning of 1984, Nicaraguan and foreign vessels started hitting mines placed by CIA agents. *Geopontes* (the Netherland), *Nort Caribe* (Panama), *Terushio-Maru* (Japan), *Lugansk* of the USSR were hit.

Piracy in ports of soveriegn state that was condemned by the International Court in The Hague is just a link in a long chain of crimes of the U.S. Administration against the Sandinist Revolution. Over 45 thousand Nicaraguans fell victim to the undeclared war that Washington is waging with the use of contras. Nearly 250 thousand peasants, fleeing from bands of U.S. mercenaries, left their native places. The material damage caused to Nicaragua by terroristic actions and trade and economic sanctions of the USA surpassed three billion dollars.

Washington refuses to put up with the fact that in Central America, which it proclaims to belong to the sphere of its "vital interests," there exists a state that dares to conduct an independent policy with a marked anti-imperialist tendency. Representatives of the U.S. Administration cynically declared more than once that the United States aims at overthrowing the Sandinist Government. Banking on power politics, the United States is blocking efforts at peaceful settlement in Central America. The United States unilaterally disrupted talks with Nicaragua at Manzanillo, and over a long period was reducing to nought the steps taken by the Contadora Group and the Support Group.

Washington is annoyed at the Guatemala arrangements of presidents of five Central American countries that opened the road to overcoming long drawn-out conflict in the region and that are supported by the world community. By its statements and concrete actions the administration is doing all it can to torpedo the process, to undermine the very basis for the agreement in Guatemala. Despite the call of five presidents to stop aid to irregular formations operating in the region, the White House repeats that the USA will not withdraw support from the contras. Washington advances additional demands to Managua that are not envisaged by the Guatemalan agreements and tries to call in question the sincerity of the intentions of the Sandinist Government.

New political thinking requires that state leaders give up stereotypes. One can no longer brandish with impunity the truncheon of a world gendarme and give orders to states and the whole regions. The situation in Central America, in the Persian Gulf and in the Middle East as a whole, in other areas is fraught with unforseeable complications. Regional conflicts threaten to develop into global ones unless responsible politicians and statesmen show the required wisdom in order to arrest unfavourable developments. The inglorious "jubilee" of the presidential directive is another pretext to ponder the need to take a fresh view of the world.

Political & Social

Politburo Discusses Employment, Health Care

LD192015 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Nov 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] At a regular sitting, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo examined and, on the whole, approved proposals by the USSR Council of Ministers and the AUCCTU for ensuring effective employment for the population, refining the job placement system, and reinforcing social guarantees for working people. It is planned to implement a package of organizational, socioeconomic, and legal measures to create an integral state-wide job placement system for the population, ensuring the citizen's right to labor, which is guaranteed by the USSR Constitution. Existing privileges and compensation afforded to workers being released under new management conditions are being expanded, additional ones are being introduced, and measures have been charted for involving those workers in labor activity. It was stressed that implementation of the measures set out should be carried out in strict accordance with labor legislation and the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) in an atmosphere of broad glasnost and with direct and active participation of labor collectives.

The Politburo confirmed the Basic Guidelines for the Development of Protection of the Population's Health and for the Restructuring of the USSR's Health Care System during the 12th 5-year period and for the Period up to 2000, with due consideration for additions and amendments inserted as a result of nationwide discussion.

In the course of a broad and committed discussion of the draft of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers, more than 13,000 proposals were put forward with the aim of removing existing shortcomings in the work of health care establishments, raising quality of medical assistance to the population, and making more efficient use of the health service's cadre and material-technical potential. The draft met with universal support from the Soviet people, who rated highly the comprehensive nature of the measures charted to tackle urgent health care problems.

The Politburo approved proposals concerning immediate measures for restoring tea plantations and raising tea quality. A decision adopted on this matter envisages carrying out reconstruction of existing tea plantations and expanding their area in the near future, equipping the industry with a complex of machines for cultivating and harvesting tea, and implementing the technical retooling of processing enterprises and increasing their capacity. Measures were determined for providing economic incentives for kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and tea factories to raise tea quality.

The Politburo approved the results of Comrade Gorbachev's conversation and Comrade Ryzhkov's talks with Strougal, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and chairman of the CSSR Government, who was in our country on a working visit. The importance was stressed of the accords achieved on further increasing effectiveness of all-round cooperation and utilizing more fully the reserves of economic integration which lie in production and scientific-technological potentials of both countries.

A report was considered on the results of the trip to the CSSR made by Comrade Vorotnikov and a delegation of the Russian Federation, who took part in the Days of the USSR Events, which were based on the example of the RSFSR and devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Some other questions on implementing domestic and foreign policy of the Communist Party and of the Soviet state also were considered at the Politburo meeting.

CPSU Holds Seminar for Propagandists

PM191628 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Propagandists' Seminar"]

[Text] Topical problems of the revolutionary restructuring of Soviet society in the light of the 70th anniversary of Great October, the country's economic and social development at the present stage, and the party's international activity were examined at a seminar held at the CPSU Central Committee on 18 November for participants in propagandist groups being sent out to local party organizations.

The seminar was addressed by Yu.A. Sklyarov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Section, and V.V. Zagladin and V.P. Mozhin, first deputy chiefs of CPSU Central Committee sections.

Batalin Gives Out Construction Awards

LD172300 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 17 Nov 87

[Text] Today in the Sverdlov Hall of the Kremlin in Moscow, a large group of specialists was awarded diplomas honoring them as winners of the USSR Council of Ministers prize for developing the most outstanding projects and for construction of enterprises, buildings and edifices for these projects. Batalin, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Construction Committee, conferred the awards, congratulated the prize-winners, and wished them further creative successes.

Zaykov Attends Manufacturing Conference

LD162338 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Nov 87

[Text] A set of questions associated with development and expansion of production of high-grade domestic radio apparatuses was reviewed at a conference of designers and manufacturers, as well as of suppliers of materials and component parts. Criticism was directed at many enterprises for their low technical level and for shortcomings in the reliability and outward appearance of apparatuses. Concrete measures were mapped out to significantly improve coordination in the work of all industries involved in creation and manufacture of domestic radio apparatuses, and also to improve the organization of trading and in-house servicing. Taking part in the work of the conference was Comrade Zaykov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom; as well as the leaders of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, the Moscow City Committee of the CPSU and of the Moscow City Soviet Ispolkom.

Leaders Sign Obituary of Malyy Theater Director

PM181053 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 87 Second Edition p 5

[Obituary of M.I. Tsarev]

[Excerpts] Soviet art has suffered a grave and irreparable loss. The outstanding Soviet theatrical figure Professor Mikhail Ivanovich Tsarev, member of the CPSU, Hero of Socialist Labor, USSR People's Artist, and artistic director of the USSR State Academy Malyy Theater, has died aged 83.

He was a brilliant Russian actor, prominent social figure, Communist artist, and a man of high civic and patriotic duty. [passage omitted]

M.S. Gorbachev, V.I. Vorotnikov, A.A. Gromyko, L.N. Zaykov, Ye.K. Ligachev, V.P. Nikonov, N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, M.S. Solomentsev, V.M. Chebrikov, E.A. Shevardnadze, V.V. Shcherbitskiy, A.N. Yakovlev, P.N. Demichev, B.N. Yeltsin, Yu.F. Solovyev, Yu.P. Voronov, Yu.A. Sklyarov, A.N. Aksenov, V.G. Zakharov, A.I. Kamshalov, V.I. Mironenko, V.V. Tereshkova, Ye.M. Chekharin, V.A. Andreyev, N.A. Annenkov, I.K. Arkhipova, A.A. Belyayev, Yu.K. Borisova, E.A. Bystritskaya, Ye.N. Gogoleva, I.O. Gorbachev, A.A. Goncharov, M.A. Gribanov, T.V. Doronina, O.N. Yefremov, Ye.V. Zaytsev, Yu.S. Karabasov, V.V. Karpov, R.N. Kaplanyan, Yu.P. Kiselev, E.G. Klimov, V.I. Korshunov, K.Yu. Lavrov, A.D. Lizichev, I.A. Lyubeznov, G.M. Markov, Yu.S. Melentyev, N.I. Miroshnichenko, S.V. Mikhalkov, P.L. Monastyrskiy, I.A. Naumenko, R.D. Nifontova, S.V. Obraztsov, V.P. Ostalskiy, O.I. Pivovarov, N.A. Ponomarev, B.A. Pokrovskiy, V.T. Saykin, A.D. Salynskiy, Ye.V. Samoylov, V.A. Safronov, N.I. Sats, Ye.R. Simonov, Yu.m. Solomin, A.I. Stepanova, G.A. Tovstonogov, M.A. Ulyanov, T.N. Khrennikov.

MOSCOW NEWS On GOSR Press Center Activities

PM191301 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 46, 15 Nov 87 p 4

[Viktor Aleksandrov article: "Jubilee Over, Work Continues. A Few Glimpses at the Jubilee Press Centre"]

[Text] Speaking at the press conference "October Perestroyka and the World Today", Aleksandr Yakovlev, Member of the Politburo and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, emphasized the special theoretical and political significance of Mikhail Gorbachev's report at the grand meeting in the Kremlin. The provisions and assessments, the analysis of a broad range of questions, the Marxist-Leninist methodology of this analysis — all of this in tis totality gives a powerful impulse to the development of social awareness and scientific thought, and will be a serious subject for reflections by every individual.

Gorbacehv's report gave a meanintful ring to the historical theme. Yakovlev's statement also rasied a number of questions connected with this. The tone was set. At subsequent press conferences, no matter what might be the subject of discussion, it often returned to this.

"In his report Mikhail Gorbachev mentioned Bukharin. Does this mean he has been politically rehabilated? Will his works be published in the Soviet Union?"

This question was put at a meeting with leading Soviet historians. It is answered by Georgiy Smirnov, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, director of the Institute of Marxism-#leninism at the CPSU Central Committee:

"The report, as you remember, contained no legal accusations addressed to Bukharin. But if one were to speak about rehabilitation in the full sense of this term, then, I presume, there will be a need for additional consideration and a special decision by the Party's Central Committee. The question of publications is also a matter of the future."

"Have there been instances during these 70 years when the Party made collective errors?"

Pavel Volobuyev, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences:

"Yes, there have. For instance, until recently we spoke highly of the theoretical concept of developed socialism. Now it can be seen that too much haste was made in its formulation and one-sided interpretation. Account was taken only of the positive aspects, whereas the difficulties encountered by our society in the late 1970s-early 1980s used to be forgotten."

"Will Lenin ever be portrayed as a multidimensional figure who also made definite mistakes?"

Yuriy Polyakov, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences:

"For the time being we are ashamed to speak about this, and, I think, wrongly so. By idealizing his image, we impoverish ourselves and lose the possibility of taking a dialectical look at, and comprehending, his greatness and ability to get down to the crucial and urgent tasks of the times — before anyone else and with greater understanding than anyone else. As for the mistakes, of course, he made some—Lenin himself admitted this, notably, in 1920, he overestimated the revolutionary potential of the working class in the West."

During these days the press centre was a peculiar indicator of the heightened interest shown in our country. Immediately after the live broadcast from the Kremlin the texts of Gorbachev's report were brought here. Large queues lined up at the places where it was distributed. And although there were more than enough copies, many took two, or three or more copies.

What is the new political mentality formulated for the first time by the 27th CPSU Congress? How is it possible — renouncing the dogmas weighing heavily on us for decades to find a way out of impasse situations? Prominent Soviet politologists, Academicians Arbatov and Primakov, and Chairman of the *Novosti* Press Agency Board Falin had to explain this repeatedly using specific examples at meeting swith journalists.

"Can you comment on the incident when a ship was found to be carrying several tons of weapons, including Soviet-made submachine guns?"

Valentin Falin, chairman of the Board of the *Novosti* Press Agency:

"The details of this incident are yet to be clarified. For the time being I'll give you this typical example. Not so long ago a legend was circulated in the West to the effect that the Afghan Dushmans got hold of their weapons in battle. But not long before his death Sadat made a speech saying that Soviet weapons were shipped to them from Egypt on American planes. Where else are they being delivered? Regretably, there is no answer to this question. If we speak today about the need to establish control over arms sales, this is due to the fact that the routes of their traffic are inscrutable. And the consequences may be extremely dangerous."

"Not long ago *Pravda* voiced doubts about the sincerity of the U.S. stand at the Soviet-American talks. Shortly afterwards an agreement on a summit meeting was reached. Do you still share the views voiced at that time?"

Academician Georgiy Arbatov:

"I was the author of that article and I would be only too glad to hear that I was wrong. I would be the first to say that I made a mistake. So far, I cannot say this."

Practically every aspect of our state's life is being discussed these days. The rostrum in the main hall has repeatedly been used by the leaders of the CPSU Central Committee and the government, prominent scientists and workers, outstanding cultural personalities and secretaries of regional Party committees. But not only them. The organizers made it possible for guests of the holiday to speak as well; Najibullah General Secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, and Yasir 'Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

As always, in the lobby of the press centre journalists compared their impressions with those of their colleagues. My counterpart was Georgios Huliaras, foreign editor of the Greek Communist newspaper *Rizospastis*. He is well posted on our problems, having graduated from Moscow University, and frequently visits the USSR.

"I think that everyone is glad," he told me in parting. "Journalists have received frank answers to practically all their questions. There were no attempts either to evade them or to pass something over in silence. It is true—I was somewhat surprised that foreign correspondents asked more questions and looked more active and erudite than Soviet ones."

The last meeting took place at the press centre on the evening of November 6. On the following day we saw a military parade and demonstration. And Monday already brought new worries and problems with it. The jubilee is over, work continues.

Meeting of Foreign Party Delegations

PM191454 Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No 46, 13-19 Nov 87 (Signed to Press 12 Nov) p 1

[Editorial: "Socialism's Decisive Contribution"]

[Excerpts] The 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution was marked throughout the world with pride in historically unprecedented achievements and with recognition of socialism's decisive contribution to ensuring the progressive development of civilization throughout the world. The fact that 163 delegations from 119 countries took part in the Kremlin ceremony is seen everywhere as an indication of respect for the Soviet state and for our party and people. The meeting of representatives of various parties and movements was attended by 178 delegations. Kh. Florakis, general secretary of the Greek Communist Party Central Committee, rightly noted: "The presence of so many representatives of different ideological currents advocating social progress means, in our opinion, the recognition of the worldwide historic significance of the October Revolution for the shaping of the modern world and the great gains of our era."

Even our ideological opponents were forced to pay tribute to the Soviet people's courage and staunchness on their pioneering path. Thus London's *The Times* published an article by V. Kernen [as published], emeritus professor of Edinburgh University, under the heading "Why the World Is Indebted to Russia," which says: "In spite of everything, the Soviet era was basically an era of progress along a path that no one had traveled before, a victory for human resolve in the face of incredible difficulties, many of which still have to be overcome."

Magnetic Force [subhead]

The Soviet leadership makes no secret of the difficulties and shortcomings that exist in the country, it openly criticizes and rectifies them, many of the foreign guests noted when they greeted our country from the platform at the Kremlin session. But the unresolved problems, however acute, cannot overshadow our achievements. In only 7 decades—a very short space of time in the many centuries of emergence of world civilization—our country has achieved titanic results and succeeded in making an unprecedented leap from the plow and the torch to outer space. [passage omitted]

Joint Quest [subhead]

The processes taking place in our country have also influenced the internal development of the communist movement. The question of evaluating CPSU policy in the period of existence of the "braking mechanism" in the late seventies and early eighties has caused considerable friction. The problem of whether Soviet society can be considered a kind of touchstone of socialism has been the source of quite bitter debates, both among the various communist parties and within them. The nature and form of this debate are influenced by the CPSU's sober, thorough, and self-critical evaluations of its own experience of activity in the recent past and by the constructive nature of the approach to various problems.

Adhering strictly to the principle of noninterference in other parties' internal affairs, the CPSU does not impose its opinions and assessments on anyone. "In setting forth our concepts of the new thinking," M.S. Gorbachev stated, "we lay no claim to a monopoly of the truth: We ourselves seek and invite others jointly to seek the paths by which mankind can cross the 'minefield' of our days to reach the 21st century—a nuclear-free, nonviolent century."

The wide discussion of theoretical positions accords fully and entirely with the Leninist spirit. This can only promote the mutual enrichment of each of the parties. Like much else in the modern world, in the CPSU's opinion, the communist movement needs renewal and fundamental changes.

Welcoming the CPSU's initiative in organizing a meeting of representatives of parties and movements who were here for the celebrations of the 70th anniversary of Great October, Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee, stated: "It (the meeting) confirms the consistent Soviet position that the future can be guaranteed by a wide combination of aspirations uniting—as is happening here—various ideological currents and social movements which may be contradictory, but are ready to fight to save the world and ensure a future for people and for the peoples."

The 2-day exchange of opinions at the meeting confirmed the participants' complete unity on the two most significant aspects. First, they all agreed that the modern world has come up against problems on an unprecedented scale. These are the new realities that we must see.

Second, everyone agreed that there is growing concern in the world about the future of the world, the future of civilization in view of the exacerbation of problems affecting millions of people. And this concern set the broad masses of working people in motion.

The entire course of the discussion at the Moscow meeting was an invitation to cooperation, to a joint quest not only by the fraternal parties, the communists, but also by socialists, social democrats, and representatives of other avenues of political thought—all who value mankind's gains and want to preserve them and use them for future generations.

Joint actions by all these forces, inspired by the ideals of Great October, can save the world from nuclear catastrophe and ensure mankind's progressive development.

Former Hijacker Murzhenko Gets Exit Visa

AU191933 Paris AFP in English 1912 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] Paris, Nov 19 (AFP)—Soviet dissident Aleksey Murzhenko has been given a visa to leave the Soviet Union, writer and former fellow dissident Eduard Kuznetsov announced here.

Mr Murzhenko was sentenced to 14 years in a labour camp in 1970 after he and 15 other people tried to hijack a plane to leave the Soviet Union. He was released in 1984 but was sent to a pyschiatric hospital in January.

Mr Kuznetsov, who was released in 1979, broke news of Mr Murzhenko's visa at celebrations Wednesday marking the 10th anniversary of the "Committee of 15" — a group which has "adopted" 15 families of dissidents or refusniks.

Also present were Yuriy Fedorov, who was recently released after 20 years in jail and Aleksandr Lerner, a refuznik recently arrived in the West.

Press Briefed on Latvian Demonstrations

Anti-Soviet Action Denied

LD191744 Moscow TASS in English 1736 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] Riga November 19 TASS—Latvia's minister of internal affairs Bruno Schteynbrik emphatically rejected inventions by Western news agencies about "bloody clashes" with police by young Latvians who supposedly intended to celebrate yesterday an anniversary of the establishment of the bourgeois regime in Latvia.

Commenting in this connection on an Associated Press report from Stockholm about "riots" and "mass arrests" in Riga on that day, the minister said: "I officially state that on November 18 there was not a single attempt of mass anti-Soviet action. And not a single arrest was made".

Bruno Schteynbrik said that leaflets of a nationalistic content appeared in some parts of the city and there were rumors about alleged plans to stage an explosion near the freedom monument. Small groups of youngsters tried to engage in hooliganism but all this was incidental. "In this connection I am amazed by the ease with which a world news agency used information supplied by irresponsible and far from objective individuals", Bruno Schteynbrik went on.

One of the individuals whom the minister had in mind is Mikhail Bombin, who is quoted by the Associated Press. Bombin was sentenced in his time for spreading slanderous information about life in the USSR. This time again this notorious anti-Sovietist chose to look at events through spectacles of pathological hatred for everything Soviet. Ten thousand residents of Riga gathered for a meeting to protest against attempts by American congressmen to impose their interpretation of history on the Latvian people, and Bombin sold this story abroad as "news of anti-Soviet riots". Eva Biteniyetse, who is circulating inventions about "disorders" in another Latvian city, Liyepaya, also tries to earn capital by such unseemly methods so that she could live in comfort after leaving the USSR.

"This fully corresponds with the saying that when truth is not convenient attempts are made to replace it with falsehood", the minister stressed.

Criticizes Resolution

LD191540 Moscow TASS in English 1459 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 19 TASS—A TASS diplomatic correspondent reports:

"Using slogans about rights and freedoms of the Latvian people as a cover, American congressmen launched an outright provocation." This is how Foreign Minister of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Leonard Bartkevic described a resolution of the U.S. Congress on Latvia, a resolution that can evoke nothing but indignation.

Speaking at a briefing at the Press Centre of the USSR Foreign Ministry today, he noted that November 18 is not a holiday, but a tragic date in the Latvian history. On that day in 1918, a government that had absolutely no support was formed on the territory of Latvia occupied by the Kaiser troops. In conditions when Latvian Red Rifles were on other fronts of the civil war, nationalist bourgeoisie, relying on foreign bayonets, drenched Soviet power in blood. Thousands of patriots were executed by firing squad or hanged, perished in jails without trial or investigation.

Americans, certainly, can have their own notions of history.

While American politicians so far have been limiting themselves to expressing their opinion, they now preach on others and even try to check how their directives will be fulfilled in Riga.

The assessments of American congressmen are the manifestation of ignorance and ill-intent. Soviet power in Latvia was created by the revolutionary struggle of the Latvian people, was won by the working people, by all sections of the population. This is the only power and we do not want to recognize any other, Leonard Bartkevic said. The main remarkable dates for Soviet Latvia are the anniversary of the Great October and the anniversary of the restoration of Soviet power in Latvia.

Reports in the Western press about alleged disturbances in Riga and other Latvian cities, about protests of nationalists and mass arrests are falsehoods staggering for their scope. There was no political action either in Riga or in Latvia as a whole. Five drunken persons were detained in Riga and eight in Latvia as a whole. There was not a single detention for political reasons, and no violence at all.

"We are a small people, but this does not mean that we cannot assess our history and decide how we should live, what form of government we should choose," Leonard Bartkevic told Soviet and foreign journalists. "Soviet power was created in Latvia through heroic efforts and great sacrifice of our fathers and grandfathers, by legendary exploits of Latvian Red Rifles. And the present generation of our people will be able to pass on these traditions to their children and grandchildren, and they do not need any assistance of American congressmen for this."

No Violence Reported

AU191506 Paris AFP in English 1444 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow, Nov 19 (AFP)—Police detained 13 drunks in the Baltic state of Latvia Wednesday but no violence was reported on the anniversary of Latvian independence, Latvian Foreign Minister Leonard Bartkevich said here Thursday.

He said that five drunks were detained in Riga, where "extremist elements" and "nationalists" had planned to gather at the city's Liberty Monument at the instigation of "Western voices", and eight in the rest of the state.

"There were no cases of violence in Riga and none in the republic. I am stating this officially," Mr. Bartkevich told a news conference.

According to a western reporter in Riga, a massive police presence in the centre of Riga forestalled any demonstration at the monument Wednesday. The main organizer of the event, Janis Barkans, was reported under house arrest.

Mr. Bartkevich said that Riga townspeople had staged a counter-demonstration to state "with one voice that they would not allow hooliganism and extremist elements to come out in such a provocative action." The official press said 10,000 attended the official demonstration, but Western reports said only 2,000 turned out.

He repeated a charge that the U.S. Congress was trying to interfere in Latvian internal affairs, in a reference to a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives on November 6 calling on Latvian authorities to allow the demonstrations to mark the declaration of Latvian independence on November 18, 1918.

Saying that the United States even wanted to choose the date of Latvia's national holidays, Mr. Bartkevich said that the "absolute majority" of the Latvian population of almost three million "unanimously support the Soviet system."

Latvia was annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940 along with the other two Baltic states.

'Thousands' March

LD191838 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1700 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] [Announcer] Eyewitness reports of what really happened during the banned Latvian National Day ceremonies yesterday have started to (?reach) the Baltic exile groups. According to the information received by the Baltic exiles in Stockholm, bloody confrontations occurred both in the Latvian capital Riga and in the coastal town of Liepaja. Many people were jailed, as Kersten Brostrand reports.

[Brostrand] Thousands of people gathered at the monument of freedom in Riga yesterday to celebrate the 69th anniversary of the independence of Latvia—the now banned national day. Eyewitnesses today confirm information about bloody confrontations between demonstrators and police. Mostly young people defied the ban to demonstrate. It is said that 6,000-7,000 people, mostly youths, confronted a massive police force.

According to the new information received by the Baltic exiles in Stockholm, about 40 people were arrested in Riga yesterday afternoon. The area around the monument of freedom was also cordoned off. Last night police cars carrying arrested people were again seen. According to the Baltic exiles in Stockholm, this might mean that the nationalistic demonstrators have managed to carry out a demonstration despite the police force.

Just before the banned national day, an exhortation was spread among the Latvian people. It was a call to action on 18 November saying: At 1800 on the 18th. New arrests during the night yesterday would mean that new conflicts had happened just before.

From the harbor town of Liepaja it is reported today that thousands of people demonstrated and that the Latvian nationalists were confronted with a big police force. Eyewitnesses saw three buses full of arrested demonstrators drive away.

In Moscow, eight dissidents tried to carry out a support demonstration. According to information from the Soviet dissident (?Valeriy Senderov), five of them were arrested, probably as they were on their way to the site of the demonstration: the old Latvian embassy in Moscow. Three demonstrators managed to get there, unfurled banners, and handed out leaflets urging support for the Latvian people's right to be consulted. Then even they were arrested.

The 18th of November is a very important symbol for the Latvian nationalists. After the extensive demonstrations on 14 June and 23 August this year, the banned national day has been awaited with great anxiety by the Latvian authorities. Apparently very large police resources were deployed to avoid a repetition of the summer unrest in Latvia.

DIE WELT On Demonstrations

DW201045 Bonn DIE WELT in German 20 Nov 87 p 1

[Report by "RMB": "Street Battles in Riga, Latvians Call for Freedom"]

[Text] Moscow/Riga—Moscow yesterday called the United States responsible for the recent unrest in Latvia's two biggest cities. Leonard Bartkevich, the official spokesman of Latvia in Moscow, accused the U.S. Congress of "open provocation and grave interference in Latvian domestic affairs." The U.S. Congress, which does not accept the Soviet annexation of the three baltic states, passed a resolution declaring 18 November Latvian Independence Day.

On the anniversary, street battles took place in Riga and Liepaja between several thousand demonstrators and Soviet police. At a demonstration near the Riga freedom monument on Wednesday night, in which about 8,000 young people participated, a "bloody battle" took place, according to Latvian exile groups in Stockholm and the European World Bureau in Strasbourg, after the demonstrators broke through a police cordon. The demonstrators chanted "briviba" freedom. Soviet authorities had sealed off the center of Riga for days, placing human rights activists under house arrest. Riga was "not reachable" by phone on Wednesday.

According to reports, several thousand people demonstrated in the seaport city of Liepaja. In clashes with security forces, at least 1 person was seriously injured and 200 persons have been arrested.

On the same day, the Soviets organized an official demonstration in Riga against the United States, in which some 3,000 participated. They were given a day off work to attend.

During a demonstration in front of the Soviet embassy in Washington on Latvian independence day, eight people were arrested for crossing police barricades.

Exiles Report Demonstrations

LD191052 Hamburg DPA in German 1004 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] Stockholm, (DPA)—Only a few small demonstrations took place on Wednesday in Riga, the capital of the Latvian Soviet Republic, on the occasion of Latvian independence day. An expected large-scale demonstration in the center of Riga did not take place, according to Baltic exile groups in Stockholm. An exile spokesman told DPA in Stockholm that the Soviet authorities had sealed off the center in recent days. All the same, several hundred people had broken through the barriers on Wednesday and staged demonstrations. Several hours earlier an official demonstration directed against the United States had taken place with the participation of about 3,000 people because they had a day off work to attend, the exile groups said.

Philby Appears in Interview on Latvian TV

LD191331 London ITV Television Network in English 1920 GMT 18 Nov 87

[Text] The British traitor, Kim Philby, who defected to the Soviet Union 24 years ago, has made a rare appearance on Soviet television. He has used it to accuse Western intelligence services in the forties of using Latvian emigres to stir up anticommunist fervor. The interview was broadcast recently on Latvian television. Its release coincides with today's nationalist protests and counterprotests in Latvia's capital, Riga, and the town of Liepaja.

Kim Philby fled to the Soviet Union after he was accused of warning his fellow spies, Guy Burgess and Donald MacLean, that they were about to be arrested. Before he defected he was coordinating the work of Latvian emigre groups for the intelligence services and simultaneously informing the KGB of his activities. Jan Corbyn examines why the Soviets chose to release the interview.

[Corbyn commentary over film of Philby] Kim Philby defected 24 years ago. His son took this film of him in Moscow, where Philby has lived deliberately out of the limelight, reportedly advising the Russians on security matters, but not airing his view in public. But now some Soviet viewers have been able to see the 75-year-old spy on television, not in Moscow but in Latvia, one of the Baltic states annexed by Russia in 1947. Interviewed by a retired KGB general who addressed him as Comrade Kim, Philby described how in the forties British intelligence used the Latvian emigre population and the embassy in London as a channel for their own purpose.

[Philby in English with superimposed Russian translation, and further superimposed English translation] The Latvians had their leader in Britain, specifically in the Latvian Embassy. The British diplomatic service viewed the Latvian Embassy and its role as purely symbolic. And in one case we used emigres of other Soviet nationalities. They were used as puppets, incapable of choosing their own methods of work or taking any decisions without referring back to their political bosses.

[Corbyn commentary over film of two unidentified men, returning to Philby] The Philby program also contained an interview with two Latvians, who explained how the British had offered them money and jobs in an independent government if they would work against the Soviets in Latvia. Philby implied that Latvians had been used in this way and he said that Latvian broadcasts from Britain were a crucial tool.

[Fade back to Philby] One further aspect of the operation requires particular attention. That is the significant role of counterintelligence work based on radio broadcasts to Latvia and monitoring broadcasts from Latvia. Thus, any fact that interested counterintelligence could be broadcast and would slip through the airwaves, even despite the strict editorial practice of Stalin's time.

[Corbyn commentary over World War II archive footage] Though Russia and Germany had made a pact not to invade the Baltic states during the war years, that agreement was ignored, and first Russia, then Germany, then Russia again invaded Latvia. Thousands died. The British Baltic intelligence operation of the fifties was a copy of the earlier German one in which E-boats were used to drop Latvian nationals off the Baltic coast to spy. Details of the Baltic operation have been published in the West and featured on television in East Germany. Anthony Cavendish is a former MI6 officer who knew Kim Philby and was himself involved in the Baltic operation.

[Cut to Cavendish interview] [Cavendish] Agents were landed all up and down the Baltic coast. Not, I fear, with any great success in that although the agents got ashore and then in due course they announced themselves on their radio sets, Mr Philby was the SIS liaison officer in Washington and therefore privy to the entire operation. And I found out many years afterwards that the Russians had been waiting to receive these welcome or unwelcome visitors, depending on which way you look at it, and had worked their sets back and led us into believing that we had an organization in the Baltic states, when in fact we didn not.

[Corbyn] How many agents do you think died as a result of the information Philby gave to the Russians?

[Cavendish] Probably three chaps, three chaps a trip, and I think it went on for 6 years, perhaps a trip a month...what's that...72 times 3,200 people, possibly.

[Corbyn commentary over film of Latvian demonstrations] Philby's television appearance comes at a time when Latvians have been openly demonstrating to mark the anniversary of the Baltic state's lost independence. Last summer and again today there have been nationalist rallies in Riga and counterrallies arranged by the authorities. Many Latvians believe that the Soviets want to encourage the view that these protests are not inspired by national and religious feelings, but orchestrated by the West.

[Cut to Dr Andris Abakuks of the Latvian National Council] They are just trying to discredit the Helsinki-86 group and the other people involved in organizing these demonstrations, and they really do not like to acknowledge the fact that people do have very strong national and religious feelings, even after 40 years of Soviet occupation. So they want to pretend that all these things are really provoked from the West and that is totally untrue. They have support from the West, from the Latvian exile community, but the initiative comes from Latvia itself.

[Corbyn commentary over film of Philby outdoors] So could Philby's explanation of the West's postwar involvement in the Baltic states be designed to demonstrate to public opinion inside and outside the Soviet Union that the West still has an interest in the area?

[Cut to Cavendish] He is a very valuable asset.... I think that it has taken someone as sophisticated as Gorbachev to realize that and to realize that "we have got this chap sitting here, why don't we make use of him?" I mean, Soviet propaganda and their general approach has been so much more sophisticated and clever, whilst, I believe, Philby has probably been involved in advising on various intelligence operations. It seems now that they are going to make use of him in the whole political scene, and I think that is, that that is intelligent of them.

[Corbyn commentary over film of Philby on board a boat] Philby, it seems, will not be enjoying the rest of his retirement in obscurity. His family believes other Soviet television interviews with him have been recorded for transmission in the future and it looks as if Soviet viewers will be hearing more from the Third Man.

Youth Daily Ponders Nationalism in Estonia

PM181133 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 87 p 2

[Article by Candidate of Philosophical Sciences T. Alatalu, senior lecturer at Tallin teacher training institute, under therubric "KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA Political Club": "Without a Crib. Why Did the Actions of Nationalistically Minded Groups in Estonia Not Meet With a Prompt and Well Argued Rebuff? Thoughts of the Leader of a Teenage Political Club"; article is followed by a postscript by I. Teterin, own correspondent in Estonia]

[Text] On 23 August an unusual and not very pleasant event took place in our city, an event about which much has been written in the newspapers—an assemblage of nationalist elements. The main organizer of the assemblage was a certain Madisson, who was in possession of an exit visa from the Soviet Union at the time.

However, it was not only Madisson's supporters who came to the park on that day. There were also quite a few people whose convictions differed radically from those expressed in the speeches that were made. In order to maintain order, the city authorities had issued permission to hold the "demonstration" well in advance. That is, they knew who would attend the rally. However, when Madisson invited his opponents to speak out, something unexpected happened. There was only one opponent, the Moscow writer Platon Afanasyev. The Communists, Komsomol members, and ideological establishment workers present in the park were unable to find convincing words and arguments to rebut the nationalists.

Not until later was the rally condemned on the pages of newspapers and from the platforms of official meetings. However, no matter how sincere the belated words were, they sounded defensive rather than offensive. This tendency was accurately noted by the young people when they gathered for the first meeting of the political club at the Tallin Komsomol Gorkom. The young people were very well informed about the nationalist rally, some of them had been there themselves. They were discouraged by the fact that a true political clash, an open discussion with our ideological opponents failed to materialize...

I think, in particular, that it is advisable to create within the USSR Academy of Sciences system a special research institute to study inter-nation relations. These problems are now being studied in many academy institutes in an uncoordinated way, without a unified plan and outside the scope of general social imperatives.

Now some Central Committees in the union republics, such as Latvia, have created commissions on national and inter-nation relations, but these operate on voluntary principles. I think that the time has come to think about creating Inter-Nation Relations Departments in the CPSU Central Committee and the Central Committees of union republic communist parties.

The problems of inter-nation relations which have built up must certainly be resolved just as M.S. Gorbachev's report said: "Let us act in a Leninist way and develop to the maximum the potential of each nation and that of each of the Soviet peoples."

Bagirov Addresses Azerbaijan Party Meeting

NC201058 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 17 Nov 87

[Text] The meeting held at the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee has discussed the tasks related to holding party committee plenums and communist meetings, and to debating the accounts given by the organizational party organs at these meetings on the question of reconstruction guidance. Kyamran Bagirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, addressed the meeting.

The meeting noted that the main objective of the accounts, which have been drawn up in accordance with the suggestions made by the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee plenum, is to further activate the work of the party organizations in realizing the decisions adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress, to consolidate party work at all levels, and to remove the drawbacks of a number of party committees in the dynamic progress that is being made in effecting revolutionary changes.

The plenums and communist meetings should be regarded by the party organizations as an important development that will test the guidance they give to reconstruction, as well as facilitate the Asian republics' preparation for the 19th all-union party conference.

The accounting stages of the meetings, symbolizing the consolidation of party ranks, should make a detailed analysis of the preliminary results of the reconstruction campaign and discuss the ways and means of realizing the tasks related to the question of further enhancing the changes that have taken place in the republic. Genuine progress and the results achieved in the economic, social, and moral fields should be taken as a basis for assessing the work of the party committees.

The meetings should be [words indistinct]. They should be held in an atmosphere of [word indistinct] and self-criticism. The mass media must give significant coverage to [words indistinct] and to the preparations made for the plenums and the communist-organized meetings, as well as wide coverage to the actual meetings. The mass media must give special coverage to these matters in their columns and programs.

The convocation noted the importance of the work that must be carried out, and emphasized the need to determine the ways and means of upgrading the pace of reconstruction in the future. The required conditions for realizing significant tasks in the social and economic domains and for successfully fulfilling the decisions adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress as well as the subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums should be created.

Oktay Bagirov, Svetlana Kasumova, Ziya Yusif-zade, Vasiliy Konovalov, Musa Mamedov, Artur Rasi-zade, Lidya Rasulova, Rauf Akhundov, Sahib Alekperov, Shanlik Aliyev, Boris Kevorkov, Nazim Mamedov, and Nurradin Mustafayev participated in the work of the meeting.

Regional Officials on Perestroyka Problems

LD031018 Moscow TASS in English 0125 GMT 3 Nov 87

["Perestroyka: Are There Problems at Local Level? Yes"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow November 2 TASS—Perestroyka (the reorganization process) in the Soviet Union means not only getting rid of stagnation and conservatism of the previous period, and rectifying the errors made, but also overcoming the historically limited outdated features of social organization and work methods.

This idea was voiced today at a news conference at the Press Centre covering the celebration of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Speakers at the news conference—secretaries of regional committees of the CPSU, Vladimir Kalashnikov (Volgograd), Fedor Morgun (Poltava), and vasiliy Sitnikov (Irkutsk)—mentioned not only successes but also difficulties of the revitalisation process in Soviet society at local level.

"In Volgograd region and throughout the country, too, no one will openly declare oneself to be an opponent of perestroyka", pointed out Vladimir Kalashnikov. "It is viewed as a vital cause by the communists and all Soviet people. Quite often resistance to it is caused by inertia and by lack of understanding of the current economic and social processes in our society. Besides, there still are people that have staked out a claim to privileges for themselves and who do not want to relinquish them", he emphasisised.

"There were trimphs along the road of our development over the 70 years following the October Revolution. But there were difficulties, too," Vasiliy Sitnikov said. "We are trailblazers, and while we move ahead we have to learn and to draw lessons for further advance. During the switchover to management based on cost-accounting, it turned out that many had no due control of the economic levers of management. As a result, one has to get retrained now, and there are such managers who have to be relieved of their duties".

"The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in his report made objective evaluations of our history and of the present day, and set tasks for the future", Fedor Morgun said. "We live in the most interesting time when we have no need to hush up difficulties. in the process of work we have to learn to be efficient and have a continuous grasp of developments. If this is done, perestroyka will begin to yield results. We are happy that we have the honour of furthering the cause of the Great October Socialist Revolution".

Patiashvili on Nationalities, Chauvinism

LD131843 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1503 GMT on 12 November carries a 35-minute program entitled "When we are Together," conducted by Journalist Vitaliy Vishnevskiy, about friendship among the various Soviet nationalities in Georgia.

The program begins with Vishnevskiy interviewing Dzhumber Ilich Patiashvili, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, on a house veranda about his childhood friendship with neighbors of various nationalities. Vishnevskiy continues with generalities about Patiashvili's childhood and youth.

Vishnevskiy then goes on to recall his conversation with Patiashvili about recent events in Kazakhstan and the Baltic area. Vishnevskiy says that with regard to these events is must be stated that "the former spoiled children that I have just been mentioning are still convinced that the publicizing of these facts only goes to help our enemy."

Patiashvili says: "I quite agree with that appraisal of the processes which are taking place in our society. These processes provide answers to all the questions. If there is one area where we need to do some work and where restructuring is needed, it is precisely on the nationalities question. Therefore, in all the problems we are faced with, it is precisely glasnost which can reveal our shortfalls and our shortcomings. This includes on a personal level, too, because people vary."

Patiashvili continues: "I believe that glasnost will also help us to get to the bottom of these questions. This is by no means a secondary question for our society and our future. Therefore, the facts that you have stated and these cases once again show that not everything is going as we would like in our country."

Vishnevskiy and Patiashvili go on to talk about chauvinism. Vishnevskiy says that many people reason that chauvinism is a left-over from the distant past. He adds that others consider it a result of the mistakes which were made in the recent past. He asks Piatiashvili to explain his position on this, on where the truth lies, and where the roots are. Piatiashvili replies: "The roots are in the telling of lies about reality. This applies to chauvinism and nationalism. They are not connected with just one single people; they can be found in all peoples with regard to numerically small groups of peoples and, on the contrary, they can be encountered among numerically small groups of peoples where their attitude to other peoples is not totally acceptable."

He adds: "It is not a leftover. It is still coming into being even now. We have a generation brought up on half truths. The only way to save them is to tell the truth. It is the only way." Patiashvili says that a high level of party attitude must be displayed.

The scene then changes to views of a farm where Vishnevskiy conducts a lengthy reportage from the Druzhba Kolkhoz in Georgia, where representatives of 26 nationalities live together in harmony. He goes on to interview the Kolkhoz chairman about recent events in the Baltic area and about demonstrations in Estonia. The Kolkhoz chairman says that the demonstrations were totally unuust and incorrect. He says that there appeared to be interference, which everyone at the Kolkhoz regarded as pernicious. He says: "It was probably just the actions of some individual elements."

The program concludes with Vishnevskiy talking about how to guarantee unity, saying that it can be guaranteed by the process underway today in the country.

Turkmenia Changes Narcotics Legislation

LD191558 Moscow TASS in English 1226 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] Ashkhabad November 19 TASS—The Soviet Central Asian Republic of Turkmenia has changed legislation to step up the fight against drug addiction.

Earlier on, the republic's penal code provided for up to one year imprisonment or up to two years corrective labour for drugs consumption, while now drug addicts will face only administrative punishment.

Another important provision has been introduced: A person who voluntarily surrenders drugs, stored in small quantities and without the purpose of sale, is not liable even to administrative punishment.

"Until recently, Turkmenia was one out of four constituent republics where, according to the penal code, drug addicts were classified as criminal," said the republic's interior minister, Vasiliy Grinin.

"As a result, people wishing to be cured of the grave illness feared asking medical assistance.

The new articles in the penal code are characterized by humanism and sensible approach to responsibility for drug addiction. Lawyers proceeded from the fact that punishment is no panacea. Prevention is what really matters."

"At the same time," the minister went on to say, "the law is severe towards those who do not want to correct their behaviour. A person detained twice within one year for the unlawful acquisition, storage and consumption of drugs is liable to criminal punishment: from fines to imprisonment for up to three years. The same applies to the unlawful planting of opium poppy and Indian hemp."

A commission headed by the republic's prime minister Annamurad Khodzhamuradov, has been set up in Turkmenia to pool the efforts of various departments and organizations in combating drug addiction.

Wards treating drug addicts have been set up in each region and major enterpris. Last year, the Turkmenian medical institute organized courses to train specialists in narcology.

Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Session 13 Nov

AU181804 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAINA in Ukrainian 14 Nov 87 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Information Announcement on a Session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] The sixth session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation opened on 13 November, preceded by a session of the Council of the Elders, which examined the agenda and the order of the proceedings of the session.

Participating in the proceedings of the session were: V. V. Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary; Yu. N. Yelchenko, Ye. V. Kachalovskiy, B. V. Kachura, V. A. Masol, I. A. Mozgovoy, V. A. Sologub, A. A. Titarenko, V. S. Shevchenko, S.I. Gurenko, Yu. A. Kolomiyets, V. D. Kryuchkov, and Ya. P. Pogrebnyak, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo members and candidate members.

Deputy P. G. Kostyuk, Ukrainian Supreme Soviet chairman, opened the session.

A report by Deputy P. K. Musiyenko, chairman of the Credentials Commission, was heard. Concerning the commission's report, the Supreme Soviet adopted a decision recognizing the powers of deputies N. M. Golushko and V. G. Urchukin elected, respectively, for Ruzhinskiy constituency No. 242 in Zhitomir Oblast, and Komsomolskiy constituency No 534 In Kharkov Oblast.

On the motion of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium, the following agenda was approved:

1—The 1988 State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the Ukrainian SSR, and the progress made in fulfilling the 1987 State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the Ukrainian SSR.

2—The 1988 State Budget of the Ukrainian SSR, and the fulfillment of the 1986 State Budget of the Ukrainian SSR.

3—The progress made in taking organizational measures drawn up by the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium to implement the decisions of the 27th CPSU and Ukrainian Communist Party Congresses.

4—The approval of the decrees of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Deputy V. P. Fokin, Ukrainian Council of Ministers deputy chairman and Ukrainian Gosplan chairman, was offered the floor for a report on the first item on the agenda.

Deputy I. A. Zabrodin, Ukrainian minister of finance, delivered a report on the second item on the agenda.

The floor was then given to deputies B. Ye. Paton, president of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, and V. A. Sologub, Ukrainian Trade Unions Council chairman.

Following a recess, the chair was taken over by deputy I. S. Plyushch, Ukrainian Supreme Soviet deputy chairman.

Deputy V. G. Malomuzh, chairman of the Planning and Budget Commission, was given the floor for a joint report on behalf of the Planning and Budget and other permanent commissions of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet.

A debate then began on the first and the second items on the agenda. The following deputies took the floor: Yu. P. Babich, Dnepropetrovsk Oblispolkom chairman; Yu. A. Kolomiyets, Ukrainian Council of Ministers first deputy chairman and chairman of the Ukrainian State Agro-Industrial Committee; M. M. Kushnerenko, Kherson Obkom first secretary; G. M. Grendovich, woman vacuum installation fitter at the Lvov "Kineskop" production association named after the 26th CPSU Congress;

A. T. Shevchenko, Ukrainian minister of the construction materials industry; V. G. Ignatov, Donetsk Gorkom first secretary; and Ye. N. Parubok, mechanized team leader at the Suvorov Kolkhoz in Zhashkovskiy Rayon, Cherkassy Oblast.

The debate on the first and the second items continued at the afternoon sitting with deputy P. G. Kostyuk in the chair. The following deputies took the floor: L. L. Nikiforov, general director of the S. P. Korolev production association in Kiev; V. A. Boychuk, Ivano-Frankovsk Oblispolkom chairman; V. K. Simonenko, Odessa Gorispolkom chairman; A. A. Ruzhitskiy, Khmelnitskiy Obkom second secretary; N. A. Gerbeda, painter and plasterer at the housing construction combine under the "Zhitomirpromstroy" trust; and V. A. Shevchenko, Sumy Oblispolkom chairman.

Deputy V. P. Fokin delivered a concluding speech on the first item.

The deputies unanimously adopted the law on the 1988 state plan for the economic and social development of the Ukrainian SSR, and a Supreme Soviet decision on the implementation of the 1987 state plan for the economic and social development of the Ukrainian SSR.

A concluding speech on the second item was delivered by deputy I. A. Zabrodin.

The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet adopted the Law on the 1988 State Budget of the Ukrainian SSR, and a decision approving the report on the fulfillment of the 1986 State Budget of the Ukrainian SSR.

Deputy Yu. G. Bakhtin, Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium deputy chairman, delivered a report on the progress made in taking organizational measures drawn up by the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium to implement the decisions of the 27th CPSU and Ukrainian Communist Party Congresses. A decision was adopted on this item.

Deputy N. G. Khomenko, Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium secretary, delivered a report on the approval of the decrees passed by the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium in the period between the two sessions. The Supreme Soviet passed the laws and decisions approving the decrees of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The following inquiries were examined: on the measures taken to radically improve the state of small rivers and to prevent land flooding, by deputy V. S. Morozova; on raising the utilization level of capacities for the production of local building materials, by deputy V. S. Tarasenko; and on moving the construction site of a footbridge beyond the bounds of the "Ostrov Khortitsa" state historical and cultural preserve, by deputy B. I. Oleynik. The inquiries were answered by deputy V. N. Tkach, Ukrainian minister of land reclamation and water resources; deputy V. I. Cherep, deputy chairman of the Ukrainian State Agro-Industrial Committee and minister; and deputy P. I. Moskalkov, Zaporozhye Oblispolkom chairman. At the request of the deputies, the Supreme Soviet adopted the appropriate decisions.

With this the sixth session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation ended its proceedings.

Ukrainian Committee Approves Plan, Budget

AU171552 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 13 Nov 87 p 1

[Unattributed report: "In the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Excerpts] The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo has examined the draft 1988 State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the Ukrainian SSR and the republic's draft 1988 State Budget. The adopted decision emphasizes that both drafts, on the whole, are commensurate with the strategic line drawn up by the 27th Party Congress on the accelerated development of Soviet society, and to the directives of the January and June CPSU Central Committee plenums concerning the radical restructuring of economic management. [passage omitted]

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has for the main part approved the draft 1988 plan and budget and instructed the Ukrainian Council of Ministers to submit them to the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet for an examination. [passage omitted]

A working plan has been approved for organizing in the republic the implementation of the CPSU Central Committee decision on the urgent measures to find quick solutions to the food problem in line with the directives of the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which called for stepping up the production and the procurements of agricultural produce, for improving its quality, for hastening the development of all branches of the agro-industrial complex, and for ensuring, on the basis of this, improvement in food supplies to the population.

In compliance with the decisions adopted by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers on the additional measures to develop individual subsidiary holdings of citizens, and collective gardening and vegetable growing, as well as on the further development of subsidiary farms run by enterprises, organizations, and institutions, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and Council of Ministers have adopted appropriate decisions.

Kazakh Presidium Replaces Education Minister

LD170245 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 13 Nov 87

[Text] By decree of the Presidium of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet, (?Mirzatay Dzhuldasbekov) has been appointed Kazakh SSR Minister of Education.

The Presidium of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet has relieved Comrade Balakhmetov of his duties as Kazakh SSR Minister of Education in connection with his retirement.

Editor Describes Jewish Life in USSR

LD172148 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1605 GMT 17 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow, 17 Nov (TASS)—"We are going to France in order to tell about the life of Soviet Jews, our culture and literature," the famous Soviet writer and chief editor of the Moscow magazine *Sovetish Khaymland*, Aron Vergelis has told a TASS correspondent. Together with Moscow poet Hayim Beyder and Kiev writer Grigoriy Polyanker he is leaving today for Paris at the invitation of French Jewish organizations.

"Some mass media in the West create a distorted notion about the life of Soviet Jews and about our culture and stir up a hullabaloo about the so-called "Jewish question" in the USSR, said Vergelis. But, as the Jews say, you cannot make a skullcap out of a pig's tail. The Soviet Constitution guarantees all Soviet nationalities and ethnic groups equal rights. Anti-Semitism, like other manifestations of nationalism, are punished by law. There are no limitations whatsoever on being taken on for work on the basis of nationality.

In the USSR Jews are represented in various bodies of power. The Hebrew language is studied in schools in the Soviet Autonomous Oblast/Soviet Far East. In the administrative center of this oblast—Birobidzhan—a daily newspaper is published and radio broadcasts are conducted in Yiddish, and there are Jewish theaters. From one of them, the chamber music group recently returned from a great tour of the United States and Canada.

Jewish classics and the works of modern literary writers who write in Yiddish are widely published in the Soviet Union. Over the last 2 decades some 300 books have been published in the Hebrew language with an overall print run of 2 million copies. Recently the largest Russian-Yiddish dictionary in the world was put out in Moscow.

The literary journal which I head widely publishes classics, the works of Soviet and foreign authors, said Vergelis in conclusion. The journal has a supplement, an annual which is published in English, French, and Russian.

Reader Complains on Dearth of DRA Reportage

PM191111 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 87 Second Edition p 7

[Letter from M. Bubnova under the rubric "Feedback"]

[Text] Esteemed Editorial Board!

I am a permanent *Pravda* subscriber. I am most interested in the section dealing with international information. Much attention is devoted to events in the Persian Gulf, Lebanon, Chad, and so forth. However, for me, a Russian woman, the hottest spot on the planet is Afghanistan. After all, it is there that our soldiers are discharging their difficult service, or to be precise, it is there that they are fighting.

Therefore I would like to know more about events in Afghanistan. I believe that no Soviet citizen can rest quietly or be indifferent while military operations are under way in Afghanistan. Yet on the pages of this newspaper there sometimes is not a line about our soldiers there for weeks on end. Meanwhile other conflicts are reported in detail, specifying the number killed and wounded. Yet our hearts are aching for our soldiers. And the newspaper passes over this question which is important to us in silence.

Signed M. Bubnova, Yaroslavl.

Psychiatric Hospital Abuses Described

PM151927 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 87 p 4

[Article by correspondents A. Novikov and S. Razin and Doctor of Psychiatry M. Mishin under the rubric "Assignment in Response to a Disturbing Letter": "A Closed Subject: For Many Years Now Psychiatric Science and Practice Have Been Shut Off From Glasnost Behind a High and Impenetrable Wall. Meanwhile, Crimes Have Been Committed Behind that Wall..."; boldface passages as published]

[Text] Leningrad, Moscow—Marina Pristavka lost her mind. No, she did not attack passersby with an ax or try to throw herself out of the window. She simply decided to try to get justice at her enterprise—the Leningrad Optical Engineering Association (LOMO).

Then the acting shop chief would state: "She is sick—it is quite clear. And with particularly strange symptoms: She is always looking for the truth and isn't afraid of conflict with the management."

After a small digression we should like to say that the story which Marina Pristavka told us was a surprise to us. Shortly before—on 15 July—*Komsomolskaya Pravda* published a conversation with staffers of the All-Union Institute of Clinical Psychiatry. This article was entitled "A Painful Theme," and it dealt with the activity of the psychiatric aid service in our country. According to the psychiatrists there are no problems in this area, the regulations are meticulously observed, and the number of abuses can be counted on the fingers of one hand. However, the young Leningrader's letter did not fit into that cheerful pattern at all. So, to ascertain the truth we began to investigate...

...It took three attempts to get her into the psychiatric hospital. The first time—in June 1986—she was examined by the plant's neuropathologist. Shaking his head thoughtfully he said: "One for us," and assigned her to the Frunzenskiy and Kuybyshevskiy Rayon psychoneurological outpatient clinic. Vladimir Alekseyevich Kozlov, the shop committee chairman, nodded in agreement:

"You need psychiatric treatment."

"Why?" the girl asked in astonishment. "There is nothing wrong with me!"

"Then you will receive a certificate stating that you are well," the shop committee chairman said calmly, and even offered to take Marina to the clinic in a black Volga. Soon after she was in the waiting room of Dr V.R. Likhterev, a psychiatrist. Kozlov, who followed the girl like a shadow, entered the office after her. He talked with the psychiatrist for about 20 minutes. About what? This did not interest Marina.

The second visit to the psychiatric clinic—again on Kozlov's insistence—ended well for her. How was Marina to know that her "well wishers" were merely preparing the ground. It was already being rumored in the shop that "Pristavka's flipped her lid," and people began giving her funny looks.

Then came the denouement. Three months later Marina was taken—for the third time—to the psychiatrist by the efficient Kozlov. He went into the office first and they saw Marina out of turn. It was Viktor Romanovich Likhterev behind the desk again.

"Why don't you get married?" he began the conversation. "At your age people think about love, not about justice. What is wrong with you?"

"It's my soul," Marina replied. "There is so much ugliness all around!"

"Then your soul must be cured," the doctor agreed, and dialing a number on the telephone said tersely into the receiver: "Come on."

How naive that Marina is! She should have wondered why a short time later two huge orderlies appeared beside her. Her only thought was of how to avoid being late for her knitting circle.

But while Marina is being taken for "treatment," let us examine the history of this "illness" discovered in her by the administration of a respectable Leningrad enterprise. What were the "strange symptoms" which caused the "senior comrades" of this 20-year old Komsomol member to label her abnormal? For brevity's sake, let us list item by item why in our view Marina became an "inconvenience" to them.

1. She was a slow worker. To avoid shoddy work she tried to observe the manufacturing process to the letter and thus did not fulfill the norm. But on one occasion, tired of the complaints, she stayed in the shop all night and by the morning had produced the required quantity of microcircuits, which the technical control department accepted at the first time of asking.

2. She quarreled with many people in the shop, saying that they were "being paid for nothing."

3 When she saw that the cleaners were not working properly she finished their work off for them.

4 Once, when they were out potato picking everyone went for lunch but Marina stayed working in the field, saying that she had not "earned her lunch yet."

5 Another time they were unloading water melons at the fruit and vegetable depot. Then people began dropping the fruit and damaging it. Marina became indignant: "You are working for yourselves!" And when everyone had gone away she stayed on to work a second shift.

6 When she was studying at the technical school she became interested in the problems of abandoned children and felt their plight with her whole heart. She went to several children's homes and then arranged to work in one (in addition to her main job at the plant).

7 At a meeting she spoke against a bonus which, in her opinion, had been awarded unlawfully.

8 When addressing a trade union meeting she expressed anger at the fact that some shops have no ventilation whereas in others it is cold. The arrogant reply which she heard from shop deputy chief Moshenikov was: "Work harder—that'll warm you up."

9 At a trade union report and re-election conference she stated irately that the ordinary workers do not have enough time to eat during their lunch hour whereas the management eat when they want and they use particularly fine tableware.

A restless, committed, conscientious, and honest person who always strives for the truth everywhere—that is how Marina's work comrades describe her. But that was the last thing that the administration wanted, and after looking closely at this obstinate person's "abnormality" it decided: "Take her to the madhouse." The compliant shop committee chairman jumped to attention. He knew whom to count on, which explains his naive self-confidence in the conversation with a reporter: "Pristavka? She is sick. A schizophrenic. Her work is poor. The workers complained to the foreman that she reads a lot of Marxist-Leninist literature and fails to meet her production targets."

It is true that in this vile story he was after kudos. The behind-the-scenes conversations with the doctor, the fact that the girl paid three (!) visits not to her district psychiatrist but to Likhterev specifically... Is this coincidence or a conspiracy?

Now a word about the doctors. It must be said that the Leningrad psychiatrists who "worked" on Marina's case did themseles no good by committing the most flagrant breach of the rules. Under the existing regulations **only** patients in a state of acute psychosis who display aggressiveness toward those around them—that is, those who are dangerous to society—or people whose mental disorder induces suicidal tendencies may be subjected to forcible hospitalization. **And no one else!** The same applies to enforced detention in a clinic. As for Marina, she was clearly sane and showed no signs of delirium or thoughts of suicide, and the doctors could not fail to see that fact. Especially since patients diagnosed as "psychopathic," as she was, are not liable to hospitalization at all.

After Marina had been "treated," Dr A.P. Zaytsev,chief psychiatrist at the No 2 Psychiatric Hospital (the same one), and his immediate entourage—doctors V.I. Elmanovich and V.S. Pshizov—were dismissed for shoddy work and financial irregularities and the reports on them were sent to the prosecutor's office. By all accounts everything went on in that psychiatric hospital. They managed to use hospital money to buy equipment for...a musical group comprising V.S. Pshizov (guitar), V.I. Elmanovich (keyboard), and A.O. Khelsing (bass guitar).

The trio broke up, however, but Marina was left... with her diagnosis and her name on the psychoneurological outpatient clinic register.

The case which we are describing provides an opportunity to discuss many other topics: the moral climate reigning at LOMO and the strange paralysis which by all accounts had destroyed its Komsomol organization. But we would like to focus attention on a different matter—psychiatry in general.

For many decades now people have written only rarely on this theme. Psychiatry seemed to exist and yet seemed not to. What is it, what is it like? The answers were known only to those who had come into contact with it. It was their letters which caused us to take up the pen.

The further we delved into its "secrets," and the more people we met, the more questions we came up with. Take, for instance, the sphere of theory. The confusion prevailing there is mind-boggling: a multitude of different schools, hundreds of differences of opinion. For example, the same man can be regarded as a schizophrenic in Moscow while in Leningrad he is diagnosed as a psychopath, and in Kharkov he is pronounced sane. Furthermore, when it comes to the psychiatric diagnosis, everything is decided by the figure of authority. A man may be examined by 100 commissions but the final decision depends on the commission whose name carries the most weight. In other words, "what the professor says, goes." But just try and check; after all, it isn't like a fracture where everything shows up on an x-ray. Of course psychiatry is a special science, but you will agree that subjectivism of this kind, even voluntarism, can create many problems.

There are two outstanding psychiatric schools—Leningrad and Moscow. The difference between them was concisely explained to us by candidate of medical sciences M.Ya. Bondarchik, a top-ranking psychiatrist.

"The Leningrad school was founded by Professor I.F. Sluchevskiy. He tried to limit the diagnosis of 'schizophrenia' with respect to other illnesses, such as rheumatism, which can also affect the nervous system. The Moscow school views this diagnosis differently—in very broad terms—and applies it very often. Even in those cases where, it seems to me, no schizophrenia exists."

Generally speaking, schizophrenia is, as it were, the speciality of the Moscow psychiatric school, which has been actively developing this theme since the mid-sixties. For example, in the second edition of the "Psychiatric Handbook" (published by the Meditsina publishing house in Moscow, 1985) we managed to find 10 different kinds of this illness with all manner of forms and variations. The symptoms which may be found in different cases were astonishing. They include, for example, withdrawal, eccentricity, affectation, slovenliness, gluttony, hyperactiveness, an exaggerated opinion of oneself, exaltation, or conversely lethargy, absent-mindedness, undue sensitivity, capriciousness, a sense of inadequacy, irritability, vulgarity, argumentativeness, or the manifestation of a particular interest in philosophical systems, religion, or art. In that way the diagnosis of "torpid schizophrenia" can be applied to virtually anyone who, in any conventional sense, is sane. There are a host of examples here but we are going to cite just one. As a result of a conflict at work the administration condemned a young pilot to endless visits to psychiatrists. As a result within 2 and 1/2 years he received four different diagnoses, including "schizophrenia." What happened? He literally fled to the other end of the country and is now working well, is an excellent student at the Academy of Civil Aviation, and will soon be flying again.

We discussed this topic with R.Kh. Zaripov, chief of a section at Moscow's No 3 Psychiatric Hospital.

"If you take into account all irregularities, anyone at all could be deemed abnormal. I could go to a line of people waiting at any bus stop, take an encephalogram of each of them, and I will guarantee that there will be abnormalities in 90 cases out of 100. But that is still not an indication of abnormality.

"Psychiatry is a very emotional specialism and for that reason there must be a tremendous degree of responsibility here. There must be no subjectivism in assessments—only objectivity.

"For example, a patient is brought to us under restraint and we are obliged to immediately set up a medical consultative commission consisting of three doctors right there in the waiting room and produce a conclusion: Yes, in-patient treatment is required. Then 3 days later it turns out that treatment is not required. We protect ourselves by confirming in writing that he was brought in legally. Even though he was brought in illegally.

"How does this happen? The militia have arrested a man, he starts to kick up a fuss, they send for the psychiatrist on duty who, without a moment's hesitation, writes: 'Disturbed' and below that 'schizophrenia' and the man is brought here. He comes here 'under restraint'—after all, he is resisting hospitalization—and is brought into the section. And he has good reason to resist! It is fine if the doctor is skilled, can examine him promptly, and distinguish pathological disturbance from ordinary indignation. But what if he cannot? A definitive diagnosis of 'schizophrenia' is applied to the man and he—a perfectly sane man—is registered at the psychoneurological out-patient clinic. For the rest of his life.

"Here is another example. A young man is examined by a military unit and diagnosed as 'schizophrenic.' He comes to us, we examine him, and see that he is sane. What is the basis for the diagnosis of the military medical commission, which rejected him? Simply that the emotional individual suffered a breakdown as a result of the army's 'seniority system' ['dedovshchina']. Within a few days the young man recovers but the diagnosis of 'schizophrenia' stays with him forever."

"What are the consequences of this for him?"

"Henceforth all routes are barred to the former soldier. Who will allow a schizophrenic into a VUZ? Who will give him a job? Who will want to marry him? After all, we do not rehabilitate the man—the 'schizophrenia' diagnosis is not removed. If an inexperienced doctor at some time diagnoses a man in this way he must bear that cross for the rest of his days. Very many of those today who have been invalided are people in whom 'torpid schizophrenia has been detected.' (In other words, those people we would look at and say: 'A sane man.' And we would not often be wrong.—editor's note).

"That is why I mention responsibility. Making indiscriminate diagnoses is like brandishing a sword. I believe that what they do in France and many other countries is correct: There they do not make a final diagnosis but work at the level of syndromes, determining particular deviations from the norm.

"On the other hand there is a whole group of people who regard the present methods of the 'indiscrimnate diagnosis of schizophrenia' as a blessing from heaven. People such as chronic alcoholics, idlers, and criminals of all types. They are perfectly well aware that a diagnosis of 'schizophrenia' is a way of obtaining the cherished verdict of invalidity and, as a consequence, the right not to work. Furthermore,this diagnosis enables them to hide from justice within the walls of the psychiatric hospital."

The covering up, high-handedness, and subjectivism that reign in the system of diagnosis and hospitalization of psychiatric patients have made the most diverse abuse possible. This is also facilitated by the lack of control that exists in in this sphere. Who can call to account a psychiatrist who is lacking in conscientiousness and about whom complaints are received? The prosecutor's office? It prefers not to intrude in these tricky matters. The Ministry of Health? It also has handed psychiatry over to the psychiatrists themselves, clearly having decided that "the issue is a delicate one, let them get to the bottom of it themselves." This was all that some people needed. They immediately erected an impenetrable wall around their specialism and hung up a notice reading: "Psychiatry: Please do not intrude!"

As is well known, the weeds always grow thickest in dark corners. And this theoretical darkness proved extremely opportune for many not very moral people. What, for instance, stopped them using the postulate of the Moscow school of psychiatrists according to which "such traits as... an exaggerated sense of justice, obsessiveness, fanatical stubborness combined with querulous tendencies (the struggle for 'truth') gradually come to the fore" in "mild paranoia."

Only due to all this lack of control could they flout—and continue to flout—all the existing regulations governing the procedure for hospitalizing psychiatric patients and and keeping them in as in-patients. However, in many countries—in Bulgaria, for example—there has long been in existence a system whereby the patient (one, of course, who presents no danger to anyone) can be placed in a psychiatric clinic only through the court. And he possesses the right to a lawyer, witnesses, and so forth. Why not examine this practice more carefully? We have everything to gain thereby and nothing to lose.

Only behind an inpenetrable wall of silence could such a disgraceful concept as "CI," correspondence inadvizable, have arisen. Allegedly trying to protect various authorities from so-called "litigious psychopaths" (their dissorder consists in writing constant and senseless complaints), psychiatric clinics began, in circumvention of all laws on the doctor's code of confidentiality, reporting to anyone that "such-and-such a citizen was on the books of psychoneurological clinic number... and that correspondence is inadvizable." Thus all doors were closed not just on the woeful "litigants" but on those who were perfectly healthy, people who were really seeking the truth...

M.Ya. Bondarchik: On the one hand, there are sick people who write a very great deal. But on the other hand, many symptoms characteristic of a sick person can also appear in a healthy person: If a topic disturbs him very much, if he latches on to it and is aroused, he can write in a way that he would never do in a balanced frame of mind. I think, therefore, that institutions that receive many letters from the public should have a psychiatrist as a consultant. When one possesses the necessary training it is quite easy to distinguish between a letter from a healthy person and a psychopath.

However, these are not the only abuses—ghastly though they are in their consequences—that took root under the protection of many years of indifference. The atmosphere of connivence in psychiatry made such very grave crimes as bribery the norm. It is not for nothing that a special group exposing bribery among psychiatrist has been at work in the Moscow City Prosecutor's Office for almost 2 years now. They call themselves the "Malyukin team," after V.I. Malyukin, the inspector in charge of particularly important cases who heads the group. Incidentally, Viktor Ivanovich, who was in a state of complete exhaustion, quite recently took leave for the first time in 2 and 1/2 years. There is too much work!

That is why we met up with him and two members of his team—Senior Investigators I.N. Kozlov and Ye.V. Markov.

I. Kozlov: On 4 September alone we sent the case of T. Dudko, P. Rabinovich, G. Zairov, and I. Mayorov, which we had been investigated over the last year, to the Moscow City Court. Who are they? Mayorov was chief of the Department of Higher and Secondary Education of the USSR Health Ministry's Main Administration for Educational Institutions; Zairov, a senior scientific staffer at the All-union Scientific Center for Psychiatric Health; Dudko, a senior scientific staffer at the Serbskiy All-Union Science and Research Institute for General and Forensic Psychiatry; and Rabinovich, a section chief at the Central Moscow Oblast Psychiatric Hospital.

Numerous instances of bribery, occurring for the most part among medical workers from the psychiatric sphere, have been detected in this case. Why were bribes taken? They were taken to establish a desired psychiatric diagnosis or to get admittance to psychiatric hospitals(!). This was mostly needed by criminals who wanted to avoid being held criminally responsibile. Earlier in the process of investigation of this major case some of those involved had already been examined by the courts. Among others, Yu. Massover, chairman of the Kashenko Hospital Commission of Experts, who was sentenced to 9 years' imprisonment (this has already been written up by the press). There have been 15-20 such cases in all. But for all this, what we have done is merely a flea bite.

Ye. Markov: Yes, this is not the complete picture but merely a few aspects of it. Although the Malyukin team exists in Moscow, there is, in general, complete impunity. When there are no rigorous criteria, when everything is based on subjectivity, the pathway to abuse is open.

M. Kozlov: When you try to talk with a psychiatrist who has accepted a bribe to give a particular diagnosis he will look at you brazenly and say: "But I consider the patient is abnormal, anyway. I recognize the type."

Ye. Markov: I can give an example. I was investigating the case of Aleksandr Solod, a senior officer in the Moscow Criminal Investigation Department. I knew him previously through work: He was a leading light—there is no other word for it—in the investigation department. It happened one day that he left work drunk and reeling. He was arrested by voluntary militiamen, who took him to the station. While they were making their mind up whether to take him home or hand him over to the duty officer, he seized a pistol and shot one of the guys in the chest, from a range of 5 feet. No matter how much expert opinion I sought, everyone pronounced him not criminally responsible. How come? I, for example, would put my head on the block that he was simply as drunk as a skunk. Other investigators say the same: "He is a perfectly healthy, sane person and a first-rate detective." But the psychiatrists say he is insane. Incidentally, he was first sent for expert examination at an out-patient clinic by Massover, which already gives food for thought. There was then an expert examination at the Kashchenko Hospital and then yet another was carried out, literally days after. Each time he was pronounced not criminally responsible. Some kind of machine started up here which we cannot control and before which we are powerless. I, of course, know what is behind it, how all these intrigues work, but I will never be able to "get it down on record." Because it is impossible to prove.

I. Kozlov: To give an example, the court is presently hearing a case: A man gave a bribe so that his friend could be pronounced insane and has had criminal proceedings instituted against him for that. What happens? A mass repudiation of testimony on the part of the witnesses.

Ye. Markov: At every session guys well over 6-feet tall and with shoulders to match sit down in the front row and stare at the the witnesses. This is blatant pressure. But the prosecutor does not even have official grounds to have them removed from the courtroom...

I. Kozlov: I think that these issues should be settled once and for all by the Ministry of Health. What we have revealed is not new to them; I cannot believe that they were unaware of this.

The abuses flourishing in psychiatry are just one aspect of this problem. The state of affairs existing in the psychiatric hospitals themselves derserves a discussion of its own. Take, for example, Moscow's oldest hospital, the No 3 Psychiatric Hospital named for V.A. Gilyarovskiy, which was founded back in 1809. Wards intended for 4-6 people accomodate 12-14 and the plumbing in the old buildings was last replaced...70 years ago.

But this is as nothing compared to what happens out in remote areas. The following is a truly ghastly letter sent to the editorial office by staffers at a psychiatric hospital located in a village. (We will withold the exact location for the moment as we hope that these facts will be of interest to the prosecutor's office and do not want to "disturb the anthill" for the time being). "The conditions in which patients are kept are dreadful. Judge for yourself. First, there is great overcrowding: There is nowhere to put an extra bed... Many of our patients work on the hospital's subsidiary plot. They carry fodder and manure in baskets, which are very dirty. That is how they come into the hospital. But as we have no drying facilities, they dry their clothes on the radiators, next to their pillows.

"The lavatories do not work, we wash down using buckets. In winter the heating works poorly. The hospital orderlies at least wear warm jackets, but the patients have only their pajamas... The patients' food also causes resentment: They get only gristle instead of meat.

"In general, we live forgotten by all. The store does not operate, the club is held in a barn, there are no creches, and the school is like a refrigerator.

"The chief doctor comes to work three-four times a week and receives one and one-half times his salary. He arrives at 9 or 10 o'clock and 5 hours later is already driving off. In an official car, of course. Often, especially at night, there is only one orderly per section, with no doctor or nurse. And if something should occur?

"There have been so many disgraceful incidents here! One orderly extracted the gold teeth from two patients using a pair of pliers. The head doctor covered all this up. The same orderly raped a patient. One again complete silence prevailed. And the things drunken orderlies get up, since there is never any one in charge!

"You think we have not written anywhere? We have but remain forgotten and neglected. If anyone comes, then he only goes to see the chief doctor in his office. Restructuring and party resolutions are not for us. Where does Soviet power reside ultimately? Everything remains the way it was 20 years ago. And the good life is something we only see on television."

Certain methods of treatment that are currently practiced cause serious complaints.

M.Ya. Bondarchik: We, it has to be said, have many doctors who do not have a very high level of skill. Doctors have not mastered modern methods of psychotherapy and reflex therapy and therefore prescribe one drug, and that's all. But it is one thing to give an unlimited number of aspirins, quite a different matter with tranquilizers, which do no good. As far as neuroleptic drugs are concerned, they can turn even a healthy person into a sick one: They depress the mind and have a host of side efects.

The prevailing system of rehabilitating psychiatric patients is also bound to dismay one.

R.Kh. Zaripov: In theory, the quiet section into which patients who are emerging from an acute state are placed should be equipped in such a way that patients can relax there and really feel that they are people. This, after all, is the main task of rehabilitation. But we force patients to gum boxes together and assemble electric plugs: Fitting four washers on bolts. But that, after all, is for feeble-minded people! But we have highly educated people—leading engineers, chief engineers, and designers. This is not rehabilitation but degradation of human dignity. We are trying to prove to them that they are incapable. And, as a result, put them down as invalids.

Our conversation with Rushan Khafizovich Zaripov lasted around 40 minutes. He then conducted us through two hospital sections and went off on some business or other and we returned to his office to make a few telephone calls. But we had not even managed to dial the number before the door suddenly flew open and two people—a man and a woman—burst into the office. It emerged after a few minutes that they were the hospital's chief doctor, Larisa Stepanova Larina, and her deputy. They were unaware that journalists had appeared in their domain, and the early-warning system was clearly operating with some delay. Their panting indicated that they had run the whole distance from their office to the "quack's" office. Things then continued like in a bad detective novel:

"Put the receiver back!" And then to all of us: "Who are you? Why are you here? Your papers! Come on, make it snappy!"

The head doctor then launched into an angry tirade, which ignored our short replies and lasted some 15 minutes, going roughly as follows:

"Who gave you the right to invade the hospital's territory, to converse with doctors, and walk about the sections without asking permission or informing us? Of course, I do appreciate restructuring, glasnost... We are also restructuring ourselves and in terms of glasnost are out in front..."

"???"

"Yes... But why not ask permission of the raykom or administration? After all, I am the leader of the hospital and I know best what to show you and what not. Otherwise you will come without authorization and see what you should not."

"You have made us into proper saboteurs!"

"But that is what you are, isn't it? The real, genuine article."

It took a long time to calm Larisa Stepanovna. While she was accompanying us to the exit ("But now, please forgive me, I must ask you to leave the hospital grounds") she was given no peace by the questions concerning what we had seen, what we would write, and whether we would show it to her in advance.

What "Larina-style glasnost" meant we found out 5 days later when we called Zaripov to clarify some details. He was not available. He could not come to the phone. He was no longer working there. It emerged that after we left the chief doctor had kicked up a fuss, accusing the section chief of treachery and breaking ranks. Zaripov was forced to write a letter in which he resigned "at his own request." Fortunately, he had earlier managed to find himself another job, no longer wanting to stay in this "realm of glasnost." Otherwise...

This incident formed an organic part of the pattern of mutual self-protection which is now no secret to anyone. Back at the prosecutor's office inspectors had told us about the immense opposition they had to overcome during investigation of "psychiatric cases." We had now seen this for ourselves. Having grown slack during the soft, stagnant years of lack of glasnost and inactivity, many psychiatrists are now feverishly fighting all attempts to look in over the sacred wall they have erected, regarding them as virtually a violation of the holy of holies.

Psychiatrists must not be severely criticized! Why? Because "people will stop trusting doctors." But they do not trust them, as it is. It is not for nothing that a large number of letters received by the editorial office on this topic come without a signature or return address but almost always bear the postscript "Glasnost is glasnost but peace is more precious." They do not trust but they do fear.

An indifferent person is generally someone to be deplored. But in psychiatry he is a criminal. Because the task of that sphere of medicine is precisely to treat people's psyche. Do not take offense, doctors, at what we are saying: We are not enemies but allies. We have a common goal: the well-being of man—his moral, physical, and spiritual well-being. That is why in calling on our—common!— psychiatry to "cleanse itself of pollution," we do not censure indiscriminately or pin labels on people. We are only trying to define the symptoms in order to check the development of the disease. Only when medicine fully faces up to people will it become what it was originally intended to be, what it was envisaged as by its great humanists and outstanding psychiatrists of the past. Only then will the psychiatric hospital become for ordinary people a hospital and cease to be the "madhouse."

OGONEK Editor Korotich Interviewed

AU101501 Sofia LITERATUREN FRONT in Bulgarian 5 Nov 87 p 8

[Interview with Vitaliy Korotich, editor in chief of the Soviet weekly OGONEK, by Margarita Mitovska in Moscow on 18 October: "Longing for the Truth"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] [Mitovska] In Bulgaria, as in your own country, discussions and arguments in the press concerning the history of the Soviet state have aroused wide interest.

[Korotich] One of our principal problems at present is to write a normal textbook on our country's history. Even during the lifetime of my own generation, there were periods called pre-Stalin and post-Stalin, prewar and postwar, pre-Brezhnev and post-Brezhnev. It is necessary for the process of our history to achieve a logical whole, which will better elucidate both our errors and our achievements. Now, when we speak about filling in the gaps in our native history, we must emphasize that these gaps vary in their nature: Some are white spots, some red, some black, and so on, but the struggle around this issue is an extremely topical one. [passage omitted]

Only today are we realizing what sort of a year 1937 was for us, when entire generations were eliminated, or how the war was, when we lost many worthy masters of Soviet culture. In our literature today, there are almost no 75- or 80-year-old writers, but the 60-year-olds predominate.... Objectively speaking, they are a generation of fathers of literature. But how much more interesting our life would be if Tvardovskiy was alive, as well as other notable masters of culture, who might still have been in our midst. For this reason the discussion about gaps in history and about everything worthy in it is a patriotic one, making it possible for us to become more precisely aware of our place in our own history, thus giving our work fuller value.

[Mitovska] However, voices are heard suggesting that, in conducting a broad-based discussion about the thirties, one is destroying what was created in that period.

[Korotich] This is speculation. Indeed the foundations of our industry were laid in our country then, agriculture developed, and vivid cultural phenomena occurred. But at the same time, during the thirties we lost all our great military leaders and many notable cultural figures. Our theater developed brilliantly, but I wonder what it would have looked like if Meyerkhold, Tairov, and other great masters had been working in it to this day. [passage omitted]

[Mitovska] How would you explain the fact that, within quite a brief period, *Ogonek* has become one of the most popular journals? For several days, I have also been hearing about your literary evenings with audiences of thousands.

[Korotich] Our link with the readers is very much alive. The reader believes in us. [passage omitted] Now the writers can say everything and provide great benefit for people, if they correctly analyze the processes in our contemporary life. Why should we conceal the fact that there are still people who would like to halt the renewal process and put us back on the old tracks, people who are afraid of the truth? However, the truth cannot harm anyone who wants to live honestly. Those who fear the truth deserve to have us mention their names and say what we think about them. We did precisely this, and accordingly our meetings with the readers are a great success. They are characteristic of the new situation, of the democratic renewal of socialism, because socialism can make the next step in its development only in conditions of democracy. [passage omitted]

[Mitovska] Who, in your view, carries the responsibility for renewal?

[Korotich] Today, the individual is of great importance for us, and it is important for individuals to play their part in restructuring. I recall how L. Brezhnev used to talk to us. He would say: "We, the Soviet people, we, the Communists...." He always spoke about himself in the first person plural, and never said "I." But we tried to say "I," "in my view," and attempted to link our own character and fate with the fate of the country. Today, M.S. Gorbachev speaks in his own name. It may sound immodest, but I always speak of myself in the first person and have never used the first person plural. For me there is a great difference in whether a man is making a pronouncement in his own name or speaking in the name of the entire country. We are not a swarm of ants on a lump of sugar, but all people should remain people and unite their efforts for the common goal. I am convinced that each one of us carries an extremely high responsibility; however, there are still people who experience fear. They are afraid of journalists and writers. We are still paying dues to the Stalinist tradition. Some people say the old ways will return and everyone will be put in prison, that Stalin and Beriya will rise from the earth and once again force people to think like them, that is, that the time will return again when one man allowed himself to think for the entire country. Fear still exists, and one of the tasks of literature and journalism is to dispel it, to plant in people the sense that they are managers of the country and of their society, that the future depends on them, and that no one apart from them will build it for them. In this context, our attitude toward the socialist countries is very interesting. We now talk with our colleagues from there on an equal basis, and have already stopped exclaiming about bigger and smaller brothers in one family. Bulgaria, the Soviet Union, China.... we are all striving toward the same cause in our own specific conditions. If one of us gets in front, this will be a most captivating and attractive example of socialism. The life for which we are struggling will be like this. For this reason, in our society today, equal rights are evolving more and more. The ground is being laid for differing views. This is characterstic, it must be so, and let us keep it so!

[Mitovska] What features must the writer possess in conditions of renewal?

[Korotich] The writer must not have the mentality of a waiter from a government restaurant, but that of a very high-level political figure. The writer must not run and ask: "What would you like to eat today?" He must reason and think like a responsible political worker. Quality of thinking is demanded of the writer. A number of writers have made careers by writing about things that they did not feel and did not believe in. We need bold masters of the pen who have a sense of responsibility. We need writers with firm socialist convictions who are at the same time capable of defending their views. The more of these there are, the better. [passage omitted]

PRAVDA Apologizes for False Accusations

PM181755 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 87 Second Edition p 6

[Unattributed report: "Newspaper Apologizes"]

[Text] On 28 September *Pravda* printed a letter, "More Frankness," signed by three workers from the Kharkov Tractor Plant.

It subsequently transpired that these workers do not work at the plant. Moreover, the letter was found to contain inaccuracies.

In this connection, *Pravda* apologizes to Comrade V.P. Mysnichenko, first secretary of Kharkov Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom.

The guilty parties have been punished.

Sakharov Comments Barshchevskiy Film 'Risk'

PM161507 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 45, 8 Nov 87 p 14

[Gennadiy Zhavoronkov report: "Andrey Sakharov: 'It's an Absolute Necessity To Speak the Truth.' Impressions of the Film 'Risk'"]

[Text] The USSR Central TV Studios recently showed the film *Risk* by director Dmitriy Barshchevskiy, text by Natalya Violina. The 90-minute-long film was watched by some 200 million people according to a preliminary estimate.

The film analyzes critical moments of history — the period of the cold war and the Cuban crisis — when the war-peace alternative faced humanity particularly acutely. In the film we observe, as it were, anew the road of the development of rocketry and the way political relations changed in this connection. The film is about our planet, about all of us, who are responsible for the preservation of peace on Earth.

We asked Academician Andrey Sakhaorv, for whom this documentary film is, to a large extent, the depiction of his own biography, to share his impressions about the film. He said:

"If we tackle the film's main idea, then, in my opinion, it is that speaking the truth means to run a risk. At the same time it is an absolute necessity to speak the truth.

"The film lifts the shroud of secrecy covering many tragic episodes in our histroy. Of course, this is not all of the truth yet, because the film doesn't speak all of the truth about everything and, in my opinion, speaks too traditionally and unobjectively about some historical events. Still I feel grateful to the film makers for having said a lot running risks for the sake of a difficult truth.

"I've already heard in the last few days that many viewers were stunned by the story about Sergey Kovolev's arrest and imprisonment, which is told in the film with a blacked out screen. It is clear that this is not just the personal lot of this outstanding man, but the lot of many other people, and one of the reasons why our country was in such a tragic situation in 1941. Of course, there were other very important reasons, but they do not fall into the subject of the film. The film shows us Stalin — not a demigod, but a man, who had a lot of weaknesses and shortcomings. The entire terrible truth about Stalin and his epoch has not yet been said, but this wasn't the task of this film. At the same time we see the entry in Korolev's diary on the day of Stalin's funeral. The entry is full of deep grief and confusion. I remember that at the time I expressed the same feelings in a letter to my wife. Afterwards I felt ashamed of this. When trying to analyze myself, I think that at the time we associated Stalin's name, above all, with the cause which we thought to be the most important.

"The part of the film dedicated to Julius and Ethel Rosenbuerg is quite exciting. They had been executed in the USA on charges of passing to the USSR secrets about the A-bomb. But if we're to speak about this then we cannot keep silent about the fact that the Rosenberg's execution was the revenge taken by the US counterintelligence for the Klause Fuchs affair. He had been passing to the USSR, during the war and after it, the most important atomic secrets for ideological reasons. He was exposed only after he left the USA. Without this the truth is not the truth.

"I think it was quite a good thing to return to the objective assessment of Nikita Khrushchev's role. As I see it, an absolutely unfair attitude to his activities is still widespread among broad sections of the population. Khrushchev was a world personality. The film shows him speaking at the UN session, where he called for universal disarmament, peace without weapons — which we're aspiring to today. One of his steps was a considerable reduction of the army and arms in the USSR.

"The film has quite striking bits in it. One of them is the face of a boy — the son of one of the missile makers, who was shot by the SS-men before the Americans came. This frame symbolizes, as it were, the horror and senselessness of war and fascism.

"Another frame shows us Hiroshima, destroyed by the US bomb. A group of Soviet military advisers came there after the bombing. Their faces are concerned, they are still motivated by war psychology. But this is already the beginning of the new epoch, of the new tragic problems that now face all the humanity.

"The Caribbean crisis is one of the film's focal episodes. However, it does not say that it started with the installation of our missiles in Cuba. Those were exceptionally dramatic events. The film shows, in the idiom of a documentary, that the world at the time found itself on the brink of a thermonuclear catastrophe. It is terrifying to watch this. The activities of Kennedy and Khrushchev show that they were outstanding statesmen. At the time, the catastrophe was avoided. An accord was reached on the direct "hot line" and diplomatic channels on the withdrawal of our missiles from Cuba, on the US guarantees not to invade Cuba and to remove US missiles from Turkey and Italy. But having in power the most outstanding personalities cannot be a reliable guarantee of peace if there is no glasnost, no openness of society and democracy. This is the lesson of the Caribbean crisis and of the film.

"The film exacerbates the sense of personal responsibility for peace which is more important than whether it will be regarded pessimistically or optimistically. The most terrible thing is semitruth or keeping silent about something which is also a lie.

"I was very much impressed by the opening and concluding frames of the film in which Mikhail Gorbachev gives his first comments on the results of the Reyukjavik meeting. We have all seen them televised live from the capital of Iceland, but looking at it in a film we feel it more emotionally. We understand it not only as a fact, but feel its psychological essence. We realize the colossal burden of the sense of responsibility and realization of the historic role which is shouldered by Gorbachev and his comrades-in-arms. But, then, we all shoulder this responsibility."

Vysotskiy's Father Protests Distortions

PM191421 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 12 Nov 87 p 6

[Article by Guards Colonel (Retired) S.V. Vysotskiy, member of the CPSU since 1943, USSR Armed Forces veteran, labor veteran, and participant in the Great Patriotic War: "Tactlessness"]

[Text] I consider it my civic and human duty to intervene in the literary situation linked with my son—Vladimir Vysotskiy.

Many people are writing about him today, his books are being published, memoirs are being printed, and evenings are being organized in his memory. It is well-known that there was none of this in Vladimir's lifetime. Everyone knew his songs, but he received no official public recognition, and he took this hard.

Today justice is being restored everywhere. This restoration of truth has also affected the fate of my son and I cannot but rejoice at this. Although my joy is also tinged with a sense of grief which everyone will understand. I know how timely public recognition would have encouraged Volodya.

Yet there is a reverse side to everything that is happening. I see the distortions to which my son's biography is sometimes exposed, I see how all sorts of traders speculate on his name. This is hurtful. And it is hard for me to resign myself to this.

And now a respectable literatary and artistic almanac (*Sovremennaya Dramaturgiya*, No. 3, 1987) prints E. Volodarskiy's play "I Have Something To Sing About..." [Mne est chto spet] Ye. Yevtushenko blessed this work with a foreword. As the foreword said, the play was written "straightaway, in one breath, literally in the first weeks after Vysotskiy passed away."

Seven years have elapsed since my son passed away. Indeed, in the first weeks people wrote about him in haste and sincerity, with no hope of publication. But 7 years is a long time. In this time a professional writer had the opportunity to seriously think about his project, the material for the play, and its connection with real life. I am not a critic, I cannot judge the work's artistic qualities, but the description of Vladimir's funeral and many details of his fate which the author has hastily dreamed up seem tactless to me even now. But, I repeat, let the critics pass judgment on this.

Without going into literary matters, I am also surprised that the *Sovremennaya Dramaturgiya* editorial board has published this play without informing and without consulting Vladimir Vysotskiy's parents, who are still alive today. I, his father, have been put in a false position which causes me not only suffering but also anger. You can probably portray "collective" types with no single specific prototype. But Vladimir has only one father and I am he. And here I see myself reflected in literature. What can I say about this? Everything concerning my role in the play, my relations with my bosses, and my relations with my son and his songs are offensive lies and fabrications. I never sat "on the edge of a chair" in a superior's office, I never blushed for my son or made excuses for his songs and his behavior. I have my own sense of personal dignity, which Volodya knew better than anyone. Finally, I have my own biography, my own experience of life, and my son always took this into consideration. Why should a living real man be depicted as an "artistic image," the embodiment of cowardliness, dependence on bosses, and other character traits which are not at all typical of him?

It seems to me that some major laws of literature, laws of truth and ethics have been violated here. I can imagine with a shudder that there will be a theater where this play will be performed (the spectator will go "to see Vysotskiy"), and the spectators will believe all this. This would be insulting not only to me but also to my son's memory.

Writer Welcomes Passing of 'Usual Unanimity'

PM191259 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 46, 15 Nov 87 p 3

[Anatoliy Druzenko article: "Pluralism of Opinions"]

[Text] I think that from all the gamut of ideas, opinions and conclusions voiced in Moscow during the celebrations of the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution the most important and fundamental was the idea about the indivisibility of socialism and democracy. It is not accidental that, as we review the road we have covered and analyze the mistakes, we see that they were primarily caused by lack of democracy, and we link the future of perestroyka directly with democratic renewal.

The idea is fundamental and not all people, I think, understand it in the same way. We have been conditioned for so long to unanimity on all matters that we find it hard to take for granted the difference of opinion we hear today in the mighty chorus of voices discussing problems ranging from the possible price reform to a conflict between a female pop star and a modest hotel employee.

As a reporter this writer covered Mikhail Gorbachev's tour of a trade centre in Leningrad. There were shiny smiles and goods all around. The new from of trade — shops dealing only in the best goods produced in Leningrad — met with approval. In former times, I am sure, this kind of approval would have been taken as a signal of unanimous and unreserved approval. What about today? I scanned the Leningrad press stories about the trade centre, talked to its customers and found no unanimity. People voiced different, even clashing opinions. Some think such shops where you can choose what you want and buy, are long overdue. Others say: wait a minute, look at the prices, they are 50 per cent higher than usual. The latest in fashion? Never mind, who can afford them? Won't this shiny shop turn into a salon for the select few?

So, the usual unanimity crumbles into the unusual pluralism of opinions.

Yet another fact. The idea of electing economic managers was discussed at the Party Congress. That the idea is viable was confirmed at the Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee this January. A number of factories elected their directors. But can you, in a fit of hasty optimism, claim the idea meets with unanimous support, say, among economic managers? That's absurd! Sociologists have conducted a survey among 60 directors of major and medium-sized factories in Sverdlovsk. They have found out that only seven of them support the election idea. The rest (91 per cent) think that the principle would lower the efficiency of management, disrupt discipline and the one-man management principle. What does this mean? Nothing extraordinary, it simply means that the idea is sufficiently new, revolutionary and complex. If so, some people will like it, some not. Who is wrong and who is right will only become clear with time.

While we should learn to take for granted divergence of opinions, we should learn how to put it to social use. Truth emerges in discussion, in clashes of opinions. Trying to understand and compare them is a democratic way of finding out the truth and producing correct decisions at all levels, including the highest. We have just started out on this path.

There have been calls of late for learning many things including democracy and socialist pluralism. Unlike many calls that we used to hear in the past this one has really been dictated by life and the times, not by "somebody".

Legal Status of Ukrainian Language Discussed

AU121253 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAINA in Ukrainian 31 Oct 87 pp 2-3

[Article by B. Babiy, member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences: "Our Spiritual Values—Language in the Mirror of the Law"—boldface as published]

[Text] **Letters to the editor are evidence that questions concerning the functioning and development of the Ukrainian language are of interest not only for experts in philology. After the publication of the article by V. Rusanivskyy, member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, "Let Us Nurse the Language" (*Radyanska Ukraina* No 127), the editorial board has received responses from readers expressing their views on the problem and suggesting various, sometimes diametrically opposite, ways to settle it. In particular, the authors have been discussing parents' competence to choose, upon request, the language of their children's instruction, the expediency of teaching the Ukrainian language in Russian schools, as well as the need for or the uselessness of a "constitutional guarantee" for this language. In some letters readers have referred to a number of items published on these problems in *Literaturna Ukraina* and *Radyanska Osvita*, and asked for more details concerning the legal aspects of the language question. With this in mind, the editorial board asked Boris Musiyovych Babiy, director of the State and Law Institute under the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, to answer these questions.**

First of all, it must be pointed out that the increased public attention to the dynamized processes of intellectual life, including linguistic processes, is quite natural. Under conditions of developing glasnost and of deepening democratic principles in our society, the miscalculations that have also occurred in this sphere have become more obvious, and it is impossible to eliminate them without an open and unbiased examination of problems which have become topical in this sphere.

The point is, of course, not only to set forth certain shortcomings, let alone to dramatize them, but also and primarily to interpret the situation that exists now in a well-considered and balanced manner, taking into account the objective and subjective causes which brought it about.

Let us, therefore, examine—not in a categorical manner which is irrelevant and superfluous here and which is, unfortunately, characteristic of some writers of letters and press items—why the functioning sphere of the Ukrainian language has recently tended to decline. What I mean is precisely the functioning of the language, and not its development, because philologists confidently assert that the development process of the Ukrainian language, far from slowing down, tends to accelerate.

To see the point it is sufficient to recall the publication of numerous scientific works in the sphere of philology, such as the multivolume *Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language, The Ethymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language, The Present Ukrainian Literary Language, The History of the Ukrainian Language*, and others. The list can be supplemented with works by literary classics and by contemporary Ukrainian writers, and with prominent literary works translated into Ukrainian from the languages of all fraternal republics.

As far as the functioning of the Ukrainian language is concerned, the sphere of its application in public and everyday life has recently declined. How can this be explained? From among the objective causes of this process, it is necessary to first set apart the factor of internationalizing the whole of public life. One must not turn a blind eye to the active industrialization and accelerated scientific-technological progress taking place in the national economy, to the increasingly mixed ethnic composition of cities and labor collectives, to the purposeful training of specialists for fraternal republics, and to cadre exchanges among republics.

The working people are constantly deepening their internationalist unity in the intellectual and social spheres. The number of mixed marriages is growing. Representatives of various nationalities read publications in the Russian language and attend film and theater shows in Russian.

Naturally enough, all this goes in step with the further development of native-Russian bilingualism which is faster in our republic and in Belorussia than in the other republics, because of the close linguistic relationship. The growing importance of the Russian language in all spheres of public life is also shown by the constantly increasing number of the republic's inhabitants that freely speak and write in Russian.

Unfortunately, in polemics these objective causes are frequently hushed up or substituted by subjective explanations. In the search for the truth, various causes are referred to, and not all of them are acceptable. In their polemic ardor some people allege, for example, that the declining use of the Ukrainian language has been "sanctioned" by someone, and that some acts permitted in this field have gone "against the constitution."

Such allegations are obviously far-fetched, emotional in character, and devoid of any documented legal grounds. As an expert lawyer, I know perfectly well that such documents simply do not exist. Whatever the motives guiding the authors of these allegations, by no means do they help either to clarify the true causes of this problem, or to eliminate the effects.

Of course, one must not reduce everything to objective factors alone. It is difficult, for example, to deny that insufficient attention has for some time been paid in the republic to individual questions concerning national culture, and in particular the linguistic processes. As a result of this, some functionaries, particularly in the field, evolved the wrong idea that these processes involve no problems.

The declining number of schools that teach in Ukrainian can doubtless be explained, in addition to the abovementioned connected causes, by migration, urbanization, and school amalgamation in the countryside, for example, and also by the fact that public education organs have inadequately controlled this process. In cities, particularly in large industrial centers, these organs did not make appropriate efforts to expand the network of schools that teach in Ukrainian. Pupils attending Russian schools were exempted, frequently without any reasons, from learning the Ukrainian language.

The writers of letters were correct when they found that we now had less films in Ukrainian, and that the language status of theaters was not always observed. Those who called our attention to the shrinking sphere of Ukrainian language usage in preschool and educational establishments, in organizing various mass events, and in visual agitation and advertisements were also right.

These shortcomings can and must be overcome. This is precisely the objective of the decision adopted by the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee on nationality relations and on intensifying internationalist and patriotic education, which has been published in the press. In taking into account proposals made by scientists, experts, and representatives of various social circles and creative unions, the decision has brought to light concrete measures in solving problems connected with the functioning of the Ukrainian language. It is, therefore, our common task to implement this decision consistently, purposefully, and in full.

This has to be done in an unfailingly well considered and tactful way, with an eye on the needs of all nations and nationalities living in the republic. This will require truly democratic measures to settle the problem, and should be in line with our general state interests. I emphasize this point, because in some letters to the editor, and in items published in the aforesaid papers there were proposals dissenting from our attitude on this matter. What I have in mind primarily are the proposals to give the Ukrainian language a "constitutional guarantee."

Speaking plainly, the point of these proposals is to grant the Ukrainian language official status and to make an appropriate entry in the republic's Constitution. Is this the right way to pose this problem? In order to answer this question, let us examine what is an "official language" and what does it imply.

Official status granted to one language is tantamount to a privilege in contrast with the others. Such a constitutional guarantee for a language was frequently used by the exploiting classes to consolidate the interests of the predominant nation. Historical experience shows that, while proclaiming their language as official one, they strangle the languages of other nations in the country, and frequently ban them through legislation. For example, it is known that this was the case in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, in tsarist Russia, and in landowners' Poland from 1918-39. This is the case in the present-day South African Republic, whose government pursues the apartheid policy.

In his "Theses on the Nationality Problem" Lenin wrote: "While consistently asserting a democratic social system, social democracy demands absolute equality for nationalities, and struggles against any privileges for one or several nationalities. In particular, social democracy rejects 'official language.'"

A thesis concerning an "official language" in a multinational state is nonexistent in any of our party's programmatic documents regarding the nationality problem. On the contrary, party documents emphasize full and complete equality among nationalities, and rule out a privileged language. In the new edition of the CPSU Statutes adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress this line has been drawn up very clearly: "A free development of native languages and full equality in their usage will be guaranteed further for all citizens of the USSR. At the same time the mastering—in addition to the language of one's own nationality—of the Russian language, which has been voluntarily accepted by the Soviet people as the language of international communication, widens the access to the achievements of science and technology, to our own and world culture."

Theoretical clarity with regard to the notion of "official language" had, therefore, been accepted as early as the process of elaborating the principles of Leninist nationality policy. However, whereas some party and administrative functionaries, at the time, lacked practical experience and adequate education, some confusion emerged in the comprehension of the term "official language." Thus in the materials of a commission of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party (of the Bolsheviks), dealing with the question what languages should be regarded as commonly used [zahalnovzhyvani], Russian and Ukrainian were called "official languages." G.I. Petrovskiy, however, objected to this in principle, and moved to establish "languages in common use." When this motion was rejected G.I. Petrovskiy and M.V. Frunze objected again and informed the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party (of the Bolsheviks) about their dissent. Having discussed the latter's motion, the 20 June 1923 plenum of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party (of the Bolsheviks) changed the term "official language" to "language in common use."

"While taking into account the political and cultural importance of the Russian language and its diffusion [rozpovsyudzhenist] in the Ukraine, it has been resolved to consider both Ukrainian and Russian as the most widespread languages in the Ukraine."

The programmatic theses of the Communist Party and the Leninist principles of absolute equality among nations and their languages have been embodied and instituted in the Soviet legislative system, and primarily in the USSR Constitution, and the constitutions of union and autonomous republics. Thus they have acquired the strength of the law and have become compulsory for all state organs, public organizations, officials, and citizens without any exception. Article 34 of the USSR Constitution declares Soviet citizens equal before the law irrespective of their origin, social and property status, racial and national affiliation, sex, education, language, attitude toward religion, type and character of employment, place of residence, and other circumstances. Equality is guaranteed in all branches of economic, political, and cultural life.

Let us turn over the pages of the Constitution. Article 36 establishes that USSR citizens of various races and nationalities have equal rights, and that the exertion of these rights is guaranteed by the policy of the all-round development of all the nations and nationalities of the USSR and of bringing them closer to each other by educating citizens in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism, and by the right to use one's own language and the languages of other peoples of the USSR. Article 45 guarantees the rights of USSR citizens to education, and in particular the right to learn at school in one's own language.

Article 116 establishes that the laws of the USSR, the decisions and other acts of the USSR Supreme Soviet are to be published in the languages of the union republics. Article 159 of the USSR Constitution emphasizes that legal proceedings must be brought in the languages of the corresponding union or autonomous republic, autonomous okrug or autonomous oblast, or in the language of the majority of the population in the corresponding locality. It is also important to note that persons participating in the case who do not speak the language used in the legal proceedings have the guaranteed right to be fully acquainted with the materials concerning the case, to intervene in the court proceedings through an interpreter, and to use their own native language in the court.

All these fundamental principles of the republic's state, legal, cultural, and language development are reflected and established in the Fundamental Law of the Ukrainian SSR—in its 1978 Constitution. They have been established in Articles 34, 43, 68, 103, 154, and 157.

Article 103 of the Ukrainian SSR Constitution establishes that the laws of the Ukrainian SSR, the decisions and other acts of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet are to be published in the Russian and the Ukrainian languages, and this is quite natural. Such an attitude is justified and necessary, because the Russian language has become an effective and essential means of international communication and fraternal cooperation among the peoples of our multinational socialist homeland. For various peoples of the USSR, it is actually their own second language. Our country's censuses show this.

In accordance with Article 43 of the Ukrainian SSR Constitution, the right of Ukrainian SSR citizens to education is guaranteed, in particular, by the right to learn at school in their own languages. In the republic there are schools teaching not only in Ukrainian, but also in Russian, Hungarian, and other languages. There are also bilingual [zmishani] schools. The parents decide the language in which their children are to be taught.

The freedom to choose the language of instruction, as one of the fundamental principles of education in our country, and in particular in the Ukrainian SSR, is based on the nationality policy pursued by the party and the state, and confirms in deed its democratic nature. The writers of letters who emphasize that precisely the parents, and not ministries or departments, should determine the language of instruction for their children are undoubtedly right.

At the same time, it is also necessary to examine the question of exempting pupils who attend schools teaching in Russian from learning, at the request of the parents or the children themselves, the Ukrainian language and literature. Representatives of the public and, in particular, the writers of letters to the editor who assert that this is frequently being done automatically and without sufficient grounds are right.

In handling these questions, the republic's Ministry of Education and local organs of public education are guided by normative documents, primarily "The Basic Legislation of the USSR and Union Republics on Public Education" dated 27 November 1985 (and in previous editions) and the statutes of the secondary general-education school. According to these documents, pupils may—in addition to the language in which they master the curriculum—on request, learn the language of another USSR people.

This provision contains some contradictions. One, exemption from learning a language automatically implies exemption from learning literature, and this has not been provided for by the appropriate documents. Two, its straight acceptance may also be interpreted as the possibility of an exemption "on request" from learning the Russian language.

Having in mind that a new edition of the Ukrainian SSR law on public education is now being prepared, it would be worth submitting for public discussion the issue of supplementing the law with instructions that would encourage young people to intensify the study of the Ukrainian language, and would provide appropriate conditions for it.

As a matter of fact, this proposal has also been seconded by those who write to the editor. In my opinion, its implementation will help to improve the functioning of our own language, provided the existing normative regulations fixed by our legislation for the development and use of the language are at the same time complied with not only formally, but also in deed. After all, even the best law is only viable and valid when it is applied in practice and is confirmed in daily practice. Under these conditions, the people's linguistic culture will have equal rights not only in the eyes of the law, but also in everyday life.

Yevtushenko on Restructuring, Resistance

PM161121 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 7 Nov 87 p 4

[Yevgeniy Yevtushenko article: "Mass Skepticism Is Just as Destructive as Mass Optimism"]

[Text] Restructuring is being subjected to resistance from several directions at once. Resistance in the form of the decayed debris of our mistakes and acts of criminal stupidity blocking up the path ahead. Resistance in the form of the passiveness of those who have lost faith in words and are expecting deeds, but deeds by others rather than their own deeds. Resistance in the form of sabotage by those who are mortally afraid of the exposure—as if of some state secret—of their own inability and incompetence. Resistance in the form of mimicry by yesterday's prospering "stagnationists" who are now playing the part of "restructurers." Resistance in the form of idiot enthusiasm for unquestioning obedience, when people do not restructure themselves but play up to please others. Resistance in the form of vulgarization, when antistagnation ideas are expressed in nauseatingly stagnant propaganda language. Resistance in the form of ignoring criticism just as Vaska did (and Vaska listens but carries on eating) [reference to I. Krylov's fable "Cat and Cook," in which the cat Vaska calmly carries on eating the stolen chicken while the cook appeals to his better nature]. Resistance taking the form of sham self-criticism, again based on Vaska's principle. Resistance in the form of frightening people with glasnost.

Nonetheless, and in spite of this far from complete amalgam of the forms of resistance, restructuring has already made obvious gains. Glasnost is one of these gains. Glasnost that is still incomplete, inexperienced, unskilled, and at times clumsy either in its bashfulness or its lack thereof, glasnost that is only just finding its feet, but is growing before our very eyes to become visible from the most distant corners of the globe.

Many people are displeased by the fact that glasnost has rushed on ahead of the economy. Some people even consider that glasnost has gone too far. Glasnost now is like a tugboat, laboring to tow along the gigantic and clumsy barge of the economy, which is where restructuring on the move is taking place. Glasnost in Russia has always begun with writers. Shutting up the writers also meant shutting up the workers and the peasants, because literature is their voice. When Platonov was denied an opportunity to publish at the right time his works "Chevengur" and "The Foundation Ditch" [Kotlovan], written in the immediate aftermath of events, that was nothing but silencing the people's cry rising from the pages against the illegalities being committed.

Today it has become historically clear that economic development is impossible without glasnost. If it was permissible to keep silent about the senseless sacrifice of human life, why was it not permissible to keep silent about economic sacrifices?

Morality and the economy are interlinked. As a result, we have found ourselves in the unenviable position where virtually everything lags behind the people's needs: Agriculture (despite such natural wealth we still purchase additional quantities of wheat, meat, and butter abroad); heavy industry (we need to replace obsolete equipment, we need flexible modification and automation); electronics (we are far below world standards); and light industry is already compromised by the fact that our own consumers want nothing but foreign goods. The only thing for which our services sphere is famous is its well-known lack of importunity. We still have retail outlets that are either closed to or only partially accessible to the public and are incompatible with the term "socialism." The bureaucratic establishment is terribly inflated, and I do not believe that the bureaucracy would embark on voluntary reductions. The bureaucracy's survival instinct is exceptionally strong. When the heel of the public steps on and breaks off the tail of bureaucracy, this tail grows again, like a lizard's. In order to prevent the bureaucracy's proliferation, it is necessary to legally curtail its rights and simultaneously to legally expand the rights of the producers of material and spiritual wealth.

Yet our knowledge of our own rights is so inadequate that we allow our own laws to trample them. The financial organs are not too worried about the low-income professions, on the other hand they are doing everything to try to prevent people earning what they consider to be too much. By virtue of what right, by the way? All sorts of inspectorates, by what right we do not know, dictate to people the height of ceilings in their own dacha homes and at times even board up second stories. No one knows by virtue of which law people traveling abroad are still subjected to humiliating bureaucratic pressure. It appears that investigators can keep honest people whom they suspect in solitary confinement for months, extorting depositions from them. A famous singer was wrong to lose her temper and abuse a hotel manageress, but what right did the manageress have to let another client have the room which had already been paid for, and what business did our news media have to publicize the hotel's dubious story all over the Union?

Daily lessons in democracy are impossible without awareness of one's own rights and one's ability to uphold them. Anyone who is unaware of his own rights will be incapable of adopting a serious attitude toward his obligations. Glasnost is a great teacher of both the defense of one's rights and a serious civic attitude toward one's obligations.

But the plasma of conservatism will continue to resist. Not all those infected by social passiveness are reactionaries. They are afraid of falling for the bait of promises, as in years past, and then... and then nothing. You can understand them. Healthy skepticism can be constructive. Today's skepticism is the price we have to pay for yesterday's lies. But mass skepticism is just as destructive as mass optimism. Overcoming skepticism means releasing energy. But this is a slow process. In 2 years we have taken truly gigantic steps in glasnost, although many more steps still remain to be taken. In spite of the fact that we were threatened with anarchy and disintegration as a consequence of glasnost, we did not disintegrate but emerged even stronger. But it is impossible to effect changes in the material sphere as swiftly as in the ideological sphere. Patience is required. Give the state a chance, and it will give you a chance in return. The main question now is the question of reciprocal trust between the individual and the state. If this reciprocal trust is successfully established, restructuring will be successful. If restructuring fails, socialism will also fail.

Now we are facing the question of the life and death of mankind's greatest idea. If this idea were to die, then we would turn—even under conditions of economic prosperity—into a worthless, soulless society ruled by money and material possessions. But a spiritually exalted society is impossible to achieve with food coupons, squabbles over Italian boots, and thousands of other shortages. When so much energy is wasted on getting hold of things, there is no energy left for spiritual endeavors.

The formula for the society we want is: Economic prosperity, but not at the cost of spiritual prosperity. Spiritual prosperity, but not at the cost of economic prosperity. In order to achieve prosperity in these two spheres at once, we need glasnost, not a spasmodic glasnost in fits and starts but glasnost that is stable and reliable. If they start cutting off our oxygen supplies again, society may suffocate. Attempts to cut it off are being made. The bureaucrats' struggle against glasnost is a biological rather than an ideological struggle. But another phenomenon is even more paradoxical: The struggle waged against glasnost by some writers. The mind boggles: Writers being nostalgic about censorship!

I am afraid that here again we have a biological rather than an ideological phenomenon: jealousy. Only a few years ago readers eagerly snatched up mediocre works of fiction in libraries, especially if they had been produced on screen. Attention to such fiction is now slackening against the background of the appearance of powerful works from our literary heritage and the pens of our contemporaries. Some of yesterday's popular writers are getting nervous, sensing that readers' interest is switching to other names. Conclusions ought to be drawn from this, some thought must be given to the reason why. But you need personal courage to draw these conclusions. It is much easier to accuse your colleagues of cheap sensationalism, of playing up to readers, and even of playing up to the West. I heard the following mournful exclamation at one writers' meeting: "No one wants to read normal, tranquil literary works!" When, in which century, was Russian classical writing "tranquil?" Has it not been said once and for all: "There is no comfort. There is no rest." A speaker at another meeting described a number of central newspapers and journals as advocates of "capitulation to the West." No. Our civic cowardice will be a capitulation to the West, if we slip back from the positions of glasnost we have fought for and gained to the positions of deliberate silence and embellishment of reality. Revolution cannot be accomplished without revolutionary transformations. It is impossible to implement restructuring while restructuring nothing. The resistance to restructuring proves that restructuring is on the march.

There are also alarming symptoms. I would class as such the insulting thesis of "necrophilia" applied to the return of their literary heritage to our people, the thesis of the "need for a new Stalingrad" drawing an intolerable parallel between the enemy offensive in the first months of the war and our patriotic [otechestvennaya] criticism today. I hope that this was said only as a polemical "exaggeration." But open the fresh issue of a journal and you won't believe your eyes when reading the chauvinist vilification [oplevyvaniye] of poets like Bagritskiy and Svetlov, who are so precious for us, coupled with insults against a whole constellation of poets who died in the war. For some unknown reason, any criticism of such theses is perceived as "splittism" preventing writers' consolidation but, for an equally unknown reason, the theses themselves are not classified as "splittist." We really do need consolidation, but it must be principled rather than unprincipled. We really must enhance the standard of debate without transforming creative arguments into squabbles or exchanges of insults. But the clarification of truth is impossible without polemics. Repudiation of principles for the sake of a phony "All Quiet on the Shipka Pass" [reference to the Shipka Pass battle in the 1877-1878 Russo-Turkish War, now used ironically to describe attempts to conceal the real state of affairs or embellish reality] is incompatible with restructuring. Restructuring has drawn a line of moral division rather than a line of splittism.

Restructuring does have enemies, and the most dangerous are the enemies camouflaged beneath words about restructuring, the cynics. Cynicism applies the brakes to restructuring. Having seen more than enough time-serving cynical toadying manipulation of historical fact, even some former idealists have turned into cynics. The roots of moral and economic cynicism lie in the stagnation of history as science. The restoration of historical truth means the restoration of the people's morality. There must be no fears that the people are "unprepared" for the truth. Yes, they are unprepared because for so many years they were accustomed to the pap of sugared lies and now find it difficult to chew the hard crust of truth with teeth softened by their usual diet of predigested food. Many complain, some even express indignation. Tvardovskiy's poem "Right to Remembrance" [Po Pravu Pamyati] is described as slanderous, Rybakov's novel *The Children of Arbat* [*Deti Arbata*] as denigratory. They are scared of art as an invitation to independent thinking—after all, they themselves are incapable of thinking and the most frightening point is that some are actually unwilling to think. What do they want? They want, of course, "to live better." But they cannot, unfortunately, realize that there will be no improvement in our life unless there is an improvement in our thinking. New thinking which comprehensively covers all domestic and global problems—that is the precious shoot being nurtured in our country today. New thinking means moral restructuring.

Writer Recalls 'Manufacture' of Brezhnev Image

PM161447 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 45, 8 Nov 87 p 13

[Daniil Granin article under the rubric "Seven Frames in Seven Decades:" "The 70's"]

[Text] This period had its own bright strivings of young people and was full of energetic struggle for peace and disarmament. Still, it was not by chance that the people and the party have defined the general trend of the time as a "period of stagnation". The capacious and instructive concept of a moral life—which I'd call "Brezhnevism"—came into being.

He was awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union in 1966 when he was General Secretary. Ten years later new war feats of his were discovered in the photo you see him being awarded the second Gold Star of Hero of the Soviet Union. [sentence as published] After two years he was given the third, and three years after that-the fourth Gold Star. War veterans, people who got not the Gold but the simple Order of Red Star through blood and soldier's sweat in the 40s, were angry. But he accepted this rain of stars, confident of his merits and having passed, a long time ago, the borders of reality—of the honesty in him which had, no doubt, been his distinguishing feature when he was at the front during the war.

The work done by specialists and toadies of all ranks shielded him from the life of people and brought fruit above all to the former. Servility insisted—a great country must have a great leader, so the manufacture of the great one started. The sham merits stemmed only from doctored reports and figures. The method was learned step-by-step-from one floor to the next. The good intentions of 1966-67 were gradually replaced by endles speeches. Historians should really examine the mechanisms of this sad process in greater detail.

Perestroyka: Remembering 'Difficult Past'

PM191307 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 46, 15 Nov 87 p 3

[Vitaliy Korotich article: "Remember The Future"]

[Text] Until recently, none of the Muses could have felt as uneasy in this country as Clio, the guardian of History. People did as they pleased with the scroll she held. Hopefully, we might restore our good name with Clio in the near future by restoring the sense of unity with our people making history and our understanding of the historic responsibility of each individual for the future, eventually destined to become our past.

It is amazing how close-knit the times are. Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at the gala meeting dedicated to the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution was particularly significant for me because it arranged our past deeds and experiences in a logical way and showed how the country and the people negotiated all the complications of their historic development. I can't help thinking that every day of our life is a concentrated expression of our whole post-revolutionary experience, bitter and wise.

The fact that we have got almost no old people makes itself felt painfully in our literature. We have very few 75- and 80-year olds living, due to the bloody war and the cruel lawlessness of the Stalin period. The inclination we now feel to weather things out, to while the time away, to outwit one's destiny dates back to the period of stagnation when the rash and impetuous were kept in check and taught never to take initiative again. The impatience for change, for the abundance of everything smacks of the times of voluntarism when communism seemed within easy reach and when America was to be left behind in a trice. As for dedication and selflessness, these have been fostered in hard battles, along with the knowledge that we have no one to rely upon except ourselves.

As we lived our lives on the crossroads of history, so much pain and memory accumulated in our hearts that we could not forget anything. Therefore, we must remember how dangerous demagogy can be, how many people can be inspired to shameful action by provocative slogans (like those put forward by the Pamyat society). We must remember that today is the meeting point for the people professing Stalinist principles of repression and Brezhnev's principles of complacency. These people are doing their best to take perestroyka in their stride and influence its moral atmosphere. Taking stock of our past experience is all important today. We are not going to get anywhere without it.

Among our numerous traditions, good or bad, there is one that has come to the fore just now, and must be reckoned with. We seem never to have had a level-headed attitude to the terra incognita outside our borders, to all the lands and nations included in the Russian word "zagranitsa" (abroad). Now that this country and the processes developing here are in the limelight I fear lest we should pay too much attention to the characteristics given from afar, or trust them more eagerly than our own self-evaluations.

The process of democratization involves struggling for dignity. Therefore, we should develop a habit of estimating our actions and policies ourselves rather than relying on hasty denunciatios and off-hand characteristics from abroad. I wish we could live up to the slogan immortalized in the first Soviet ABC-Book: "MY NE RABY, RABY NE MY!" (We Are No Slaves).

Another conclusion I've drawn from recent experience has to do with vigilance. The forces striving to reverse our motion are tireless and have nothing to lose. If we claim to be making the revolution, we must bear in mind that revolution must know how to defend itself. We are moving ahead relying on our people's experience of past decades. In the name of our future we must not forget a single lesson of our difficult past, if only for the sake of the people who learnt those lessons the hard way.

Need for Historical Awareness Argued

PM181027 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 10 Nov 87 p 3

[Article by Yuriy Pompeyev under the rubric "We Are Descendants of October": "The Current of History"—boldface passages as published]

[Text] Ordinary days and red-letter days succeed one another in our lives... But there are times when the current of life suddenly enters rapids and heads for a sharp bend from where new horizons can be discerned and the headwaters themselves can be seen more clearly and distinctly.

The current of history! No October celebration has seemed to me as disturbing and fateful as the present one—and not only for our country but for the world. The point is not that we are waiting for another summit meeting or the fact that, as John Steinbeck said long ago, people across the Atlantic have become accustomed to putting everything into abuse of the Russians: "Not a day passes without their being vilified." Nor does it reside in the contradictoriness of present events: Workers at one plant set up a "revolutionary committee to help restructuring" while at another pacesetters have a tough time because their excellent performance upsets the balance of deception and leveling established over the years. Nor even does it lie in glasnost or the diversity of thought and different stances and opinions illuminated by it. In the conditions of profound democracy and openness which we are grasping, albeit with difficulty, emulation and competition among social groups and groupings are inevitable provided that this diversity of thought is not, as it were, metered out according to the "some for us, some for you" principle but benefits the struggle to renew socialism and ensure social justice, which constitutes the essence of our system. Just as it was during October 1917, when the Bolsheviks resolutely set about extricating Russia from the catastrophic position that threatened it.

During the 40 months of the imperialist war the Bolsheviks' tactics were **the only** internationalist tactics, since they were based not on a narrow nationalist desire to defend "their own" fatherland (the fatherland of their own bourgeoisie) while saying to hell with everything else but on correct **consideration** of the revolutionary situation in Europe. October, in the words of the zealous patriots of the time, saw the triumph of "internationalist folly" over the good sense of liberals and many socialists. Yet it was a question not just of the most sensible and correct political step but of the future too. The Decree on Peace, proclaimed over the heads of the governments of the warring countries, was the first example of astounding new thinking and people's diplomacy. The Russian revolution showed how it was possible to get out of the war and what immense effort it cost. Effort and work among the masses on a larger scale than was needed to overcome the disagreements among members of the Bolshevik Central Committee, as reflected in Mikhail Shatrov's "The Brest Peace."

The peace struggle was extremely dramatic but at Lenin's insistance the first separate armistice with Germany was signed at Brest-Litovsk by 20 November (old style). The party firmly carried out the promises given to the people. The publication in the newspapers at that time of Russia's secret treaties with its allies was an example of worldwide glasnost. That is the reason why the struggle to destroy weapons of mass suicide initiated by the party and Soviet Government is today beginning to have a powerful ethical effect upon the world.

Are there any grounds for feeling worried then in the 70th anniversary year? I think there are. It is no wonder after so many years of social passivity that the people are inundating with letters our party Central Committee ("Keep going straight ahead!") and the editorial offices of newspapers, which are awakening social activeness on the part of working people and their sense of personal dignity. At the same time I can understand the apprehension of a young woman who asked me: "Please advise me on what I can give my 16-year-old son to read about our history." No, it is no coincidence that these questions arise today, in no way out of idle curiosity but out of a sincere desire to discover what kind of people we, the heirs of Great October, are. That is why we must not just reassure one another with jubilee toasts. Here our party is setting us an example of a fearless analytical approach. The problems confronting us at this new juncture are serious and significant, they demand a high degree of awareness and understanding by the people of the path we have traveled.

I would like to highlight one alarming feature among many: our mass historical ignorance. It is precisely this which sometimes makes people feel confused and spiritually helpless. Like Andrey Platonov's "inner man," many who read historical articles today are in the state of being mere "spiritual embryos" (this expression is applied by the critic Yuriy Andreyev to certain of Platonov's heroes). The same Andrey Platonov compared history to a locomotive hauling uphill the "world's load of poverty, despair, and resigned inertia." Boris Pasternak made the cool, farsighted observation that modern history is only the insulation on the cable: It does not stop the electric current. And a writer like Bukharin in his final words in court gave the following definition: World history is a world tribunal. The thrust of certain opinions expressed about history today which describe it as an unpredictable waterfall of events or as the activity of a person pursuing his own goals amounts to a statement of the obvious—the obvious contradictions between an idea and its realization. A most graphic example of this is provided by Anatoliy Rybakov's "Children of the Arbat," in which the author shuns historical accuracy in his depiction of the events leading to the death of S.M. Kirov. Here I agree with the opinion of Aleksandr Latsis: "There are events in history where factual accuracy is more tragic than any artistic invention."

Of course, the restoration of the full picture of our socialist history instead of the selective version (or rather the one that comes down to us by default) is no short-term task. But we cannot delay or take half-measures. It is appropriate to recall S.M. Kirov's exclamation: "Can we aspire to the title of educated people if we do not know the fatherland's history!" Let us add—politically educated... The present replacement even at the Higher Party School of the course "Party History" by a subject entitled "Historical Experience of the CPSU" is no more than a compromise. Meanwhile fragmentary material is being published which, in place of the distorting mirror of the "Short Course" [produced by Stalin], creates a new stereotype. When an acute shortage of historical truth padded out by phrases about "major achievements" and "grave errors" obtains, the complete picture disappears. Images of "ideal" peasants of the civil war period (as if Vyacheslav Shishkov's "The Gang," "Jocular Tales," and his essay "With a Knapsack" were unknown to literature) and scenes of forcible socialism in the countryside without clear sociohistorical analysis arise before a dumbfounded public. The absence of such analysis can produce new cliches similar to the far from harmless whisper of the frightened philistine—Are the ideals of socialism not alien to the Russian people and their "age-old morality"?

However, could the October Revolution have triumphed in so short a time if it were not for its people's character and the active participation of the broad people's masses? The slogans of Bolshevism gripped the masses before October and during the civil war and became a force only because they called for equality, justice, and collectivism, which is precisely what distinguished our people's finest aspirations. It was this that undermined the enemies of revolution, who described it as a "slaves' revolt" that brought "divine retribution" to Russia. Time and time again the "Black Hundred" idea of the writers Belotsvetov and General Krasnov is resuscitated: The October Revolution was the result of the conspiratorial activity of the world Zionist center. "A Russian Caesar will save the motherland and ride into Moscow in triumph on a white horse," today's opponents, A. Zinovyev and A. Solzhenitsyn, belligerently repeat in imitation of Aldanov and Breshko-Breshkovskiy. Let us not forget that the present-day emigres, as in the years of "Russia number two," try convulsively to fill in the blanks in our unconsciousness.

I see truth not only in the broad quests of writers, journalists, and historians, who have to overcome confusion and the new one-sidedness, or in the possibility of expressing different points of view, in socialist pluralism, (although we have become accustomed to thinking the same way to the point of madness), but also in the assertion of and discoveries along the path of a profound belief in socialism and in the ideas, problems, and experiences created by October itself. There is much in our history that we will not understand unless we are aware of the ideological disputes of those years and unless we absorb and digest them. It ill becomes our mature society to hide or even to fear its own legacy. What is needed here is a broad and thorough view which does not exclude different approaches.

I shall dwell on a recent example.

The historical roots of our new economic model are described by Nikolay Shmelev in the article "Advance Payments and Debts" in *Novyy Mir*. There are many correct and profound observations and ideas in that article but some things are contentious. At the very outset the journalist cites the familiar reproaches of Sukhanov and other Mensheviks to the effect that at the moment of the victory of the revolution in Russia none of its recognized theoreticians or more authoritative practitioners even had any ideas about the shape of the future socialist economic system. Marx' work contained "mere guesses," while Lenin's works were mainly devoted to "pure politics." (There is no need to dispute that distortion of the facts, you only have to open any of Vladimir Ilich's works to see for yourself that the opposite is true.) But nevertheless in this regard I am going to cite the evidence of economists and revolutionaries who did not always share Lenin's views and considered him an "adroit" tactician and strategist. Bukharin, recalling the unusual boldness with which Vladimir Ilich posed questions of economic theory and practice, wrote: "Vladimir Ilich looked much further into the future than all we sinners. Those who did not keep pace with him were left on the other side of the barricade." Preobrazhenskiy, a supporter of Trotskiy's platform, wrote: "As an economist, Lenin left us many most valuable works, among the best in Marxist literature as a whole."

There would be no need to prove that fact had hundreds of thousands of *Novyy Mir*'s readers not believed the author of the article when he wrote that "in the initial period of the revolution, Lenin proceeded from the premise that capitalism had already created for socialism all the necessary economic forms and that it was only necessary to give them new, socialist content." That was in a war-torn peasant Russia at a time when not only the state bureaucratic apparatus but also the army had been utterly destroyed. Furthermore, "at a certain moment," the journalist writes, "Lenin apparently began to believe himself that command methods are also the basic methods of the socialist economy."

When pondering the "vacillations" of Lenin, the theoretician and practitioner of socialist economics, the author of the article rejects an integrated assessment of the economic views of Stalin, who indeed, to use his own simile, knew hardly any more about actual economics than the King of Abyssinia knew about higher mathematics. Stalin repudiated profitability (you cannot take a mercantile view of it). He counterposed the growth of the people's labor productivity to rates of production, and the infamous notion of gross output came into force. Mismanagement and disorder (Vladimir Ilich himself wrote articles on labor organization and urged people to learn how to work) as well as theft and embezzlement were linked by Stalin simply with the counterrevolutionary activity of "yesterday's men" and "enemies of the people," who could include anybody. Nullifying the correctness of the party line by claiming that distortions are inevitable and that it is very rare for ruling parties to manage to implement that line, Stalin transformed Communists into the "taskmasters" of the country and replaced democracy with bureaucracy and stereotyped working. He not only cultivated bureaucracy by means of various privileges but also gave its existence an "ideological basis" by declaring the very idea of self-management a harmful deviation.

In chapter one of "The State and Revolution" Lenin warned: There have been occasions in history when the teaching of the great revolutionaries was distorted after their death; attempts were made to convert them into harmless icons, but in hallowing their names the revolutionary edge of their teaching was blunted and vulgarized... A bitter thought.

I see this as one of the fundamental questions for our current affairs journalism: Why did the party through its supreme organ—the congress—nominate Stalin as its leader at five successive congresses in the first 10 years after Lenin's death even though Vladimir Ilich's well known testament was repeatedly mentioned on the congress platform and backstage?

As for Lenin and his contribution to the creation of the socialist economy, which has still not been truly appreciated, I shall confine myself to the evidence of an historian and a contemporary of Vladimir Ilich: "It would be a great gain for Soviet power if the collective work of the Gosplan, the Central Statistical Administration, and the many people's commissariats and local organizations were of as much scirntific and practical value for our time as the work of Lenin alone is for the 20th century."

When considering the experience of the revolution and its origins today, another point must be mentioned. Our movement forward, "from repentance to action" (to use Dmitriy Sergeyevich Likhachev's expression) must undergo the stage of cleansing of accretions alien to socialism. The masses have a high sense of justice, the people, whose judgement is based on common sense, are not wrong about **what** makes the bureaucrat cling to the old and make every effort to put a brake on restructuring. It is useful to recall in this connection the decree on the maximum monthly wage for people's commissars. But the point is not its size. No one would have begrudged higher rates of pay to leaders who shouldered the extremely heavy burden of saving the country from war, hunger, and ruin. Nor is the point that we should mechanically apply those norms to the present day—

after all, we have traveled a long way from the asceticism of those years. The main point is that the decree signed by Lenin on 18 November 1917 was published immediately in the newspapers and that the very nature of the new power precluded mercenary schemes.

Here is a recent example. It transpired that Eduard Eduardovich Smigla, a former Latvian red rifleman and a party member for 70 years, does not take advantage of his statutory benefits: food entitlements and special canteens. He explains it in these terms: "We fought for benefits for all, not for villas hidden away behind high fences for some and for parcels through the back door for the chosen ones."

Bolshevik Smigla, a member of Lenin's personal guard, has preserved his spirit of Leninist socialist conviction, which does not allow privileges for particular groups. The only privilege for a rational being is freedom, there can be no other. Therein lies the Leninist ethic and the undying traditions of Bolshevism, which current affairs thinking must crystallize in the social consciousness and defend every day. After all, convictions are the principles of our actions.

The proletarian state infuses the world with health now just as it did 70 years ago. No force in the world will be able to erase the gains of the October Revolution. But gains are only gains, they merely open the door to the future. In Lenin's firm, clear, and sober way, without the banal optimism and compromise decisions typical of bureaucracy but in a revolutionary way, we must separate the world historic achievement of the October Revolution from what has not yet been created and from what needs to be redone, reworked, improved, and check every time: How communist are our movements backward and our steps forward, to what extent do the specific carriers of evil still thrive, and how inevitable is their defeat. Let us in Leninist manner compare the state of the society in which we find ourselves not with a jelly but with the smelting of a metal during the production of a more durable alloy. That is the crux of the matter, as Vladimir Ilich was fond of saying.

No, it is not for effect that we say again today—the revolution goes on! In our thoughts, self-knowledge, and practical deeds. It is not the dead ashes of revolution but the bright flame which warms the heart.

Afanasyev on Historiography Controversy

PM121353 Copenhagen DET FRI AKTUELT in Danish 8 Nov 87 p 13

[Interview with Dr Yuriy Afanasyev, Moscow Institute for History and Archives director [title as published], by APN correspondent Vitaliy Dymarskiy: "History as Propaganda"]

[Text] [Dymarskiy] Today an explosion of interest in history is taking place in the Soviet Union. What is the cause of this?

[Afanasyev] Yes, recently a lot of articles on historical topics have been published in the press and in literary periodicals, and historians are in great demand from all sides: Everyone wants them to lecture, deliver introductory remarks at meetings, and so on.

I see the explanation in the following: After the 27th party congress in 1986 the atmosphere in our country began to change radically. It became possible to discuss many problems freely, including history.

Historical research today also serves to uncover the roots of the deformities and the deviations from the Leninist principles for the building of socialism which the Soviet leadership has mentioned several times recently. In general terms, one can say that knowledge of the past helps man to build his future. Today the future of the world is threatened not only by the major dangers such as the threat of war and global problems. Man is generally uncertain about the future and feels himself to be on shaky ground. That is why many people want to look back, to find some connections, threads, a foundation, in order to get firmer ground under their feet.

[Dymarskiy] Looking back into history is the same as looking straight into the face of real people who have been involved in the creation of history. But if we look in the history books, there are a number of prominent revolutionaries who have—shall we say—fallen out of view and who are unknown to today's young people. In the recently published encyclopedia of the revolution there are 22 new biographical articles, including ones on Bukharin, Zinovyev, Kamenev, Rykov, Trotskiy, Shlapnikov, and others who played an important role in 1917...

[Afanasyev] I have seen Abuladze's film *Repentance*, which raises controversial problems in Soviet—and, for that matter, not only Soviet—history, three times. Once as I was leaving the auditorium I heard a conversation among some young people, and someone said: "The things they did down in Georgia, and we knew nothing about it." I can say both as a historian and as director of this institute that young people either have no knowledge at all of large areas of our earlier and more recent history, or they know it in a distorted form.

Perhaps some have heard of Stalin, but of Khrushchev and his era—almost nothing. About the people who carried out the revolution together with Lenin and who later were the targets of reprisals there are a few stereotyped phrases, which are then simply repeated by the students, in school books and university textbooks. They certainly do not know either that these phrases come from Stalin's "Short Course" in party history. This pattern is also still to be found in our historical writings.

The people who still believe that in the last 70 years everything has been done "in accordance with Lenin" are themselves clearly unaware what trap they are falling into. For the logical conclusion has to be that Stalin's persecutions were "foreseen" by Lenin, even though he, as everyone knows, was a confirmed supporter of democratic forms of socialism and considered struggles between ideas the norm. Without this knowledge it is also impossible to understand the conditions which require a revolutionary reorganization of society, as decided by the 27th congress, which intended precisely to ensure that everything in the Soviet Union will be "in accordance with Lenin."

[Dymarskiy] Is it that simple? Are there not differences of opinion about this even today among historians?

[Afanasyev] Until recently history had the role of propaganda's errand boy. As our society was before the 27th congress it really had no need for history as science.

When I say that historical science has discredited itself and shown itself to be unable to qualify processes and events in our society, this is a criticism of our circle of historians, even though I am one of them. It is also from here that one hears the negative reactions to what are in my view realistic assessments which have been heard recently and which some have described as defamation.

It must be clear that a statement to the effect that Bukharin certainly was not a criminal is not well received by those who have written mountains of dissertations and books about the struggle against the opposition. I am not here saying that there was no opposition or deviations within the party. Of course there were, but they must be researched scientifically, and first and foremost we must remove the fantastic allegations that were leveled against the opposition figures. It is not necessary to be a professional historian, it is enough to be a honest person to say that the "criminal" Bukharin never existed. On the whole the concept of "oppositional criminals" is one of Stalin's inventions, which he used to get rid of these people.

Let us view our history as a series of realized and, more often, unrealized alternatives. Many people have had the impression that because we received a new global-historic impulse in 1917 our column will move from victory to victory. But practice has shown that the optimum decisions must be sought almost daily, that we must live, as it were, through the choice contained in choice [as published]. I mean that a choice made once does not relieve us of the necessity of making choices again and again and weighing up alternatives. This is, for that matter, a factor that helps to explain our age's great interest in historical science.

Seminar on CPSU History Opens 17 Nov

PM181129 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 87 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "On the Theme of Experience"]

[Text] An all-union seminar organized by the "Znaniye" society and the USSR Academy of Sciences History Department, began 17 November. Its theme is "The Historical Experience of the CPSU in the Light of the 70th Anniversary of the Great October Revolution." The program includes reports on topical questions of Lenin's plan for socialist building, the experience of socialist industrialization in the USSR and the collectivization of agriculture, the implementation of the party's nationalities policy, some problems of the history of the Great Patriotic War, the new stage of the reform of the management of the Soviet economy, and other topics.

Response to Restructuring 'Positive'

LD171159 Moscow TASS in English 0817 GMT 17 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS—A public opinion poll held by the Institute of Sociological Studies under the USSR Academy of Sciences at six industrial enterprises of Moscow has shown that a new atmosphere in the country made workers and engineers more active.

According to sociological studies, in 1985 only one third of those employed in industry believed that they worked at their full capacity, while the recent poll revealed an entirely different situation. Some 75 per cent of the polled said that they were making a practical contribution to perestroyka (the restructuring).

Perestroyka is making a high demand on the professional skill of workers. 38 per cent of the polled improved their skill or learned a related trade.

In the opinion of the polled, positive changes brought about by perestroyka are evident. the most significant change for the better was observed in the quality of products and production planning.

Most of the polled are optimistic about the future. They are sure that the coming into force early in 1988 of the law on the state enterprise will provide them with real levers for taking part in the management of their enterprises.

Book on 'Soviet Society Today' Published

PM201102 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 87 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "About Restructuring"]

[Text] The book *Soviet Society Today (Questions and Answers)* [*Sovetskoye Obshchestvo Segodnya (Voprosy i Otvety)*] has been published. Journalists and scientists — economists, sociologists, philosophers, historians, medical experts, and lawyers — took part in compiling the book, which reflects in critical and sometimes contentions form on the progress of the restructuring in all spheres of our society.

The book is published by the Political Literature Publishing House.

Markov Comments on State Prize Awards

PM171017 Moscow TRUD in Russian 8 Nov 87 p 2

[TASS-attributed article by G. Markov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Committee for Lenin and State Prizes in Literature, Art, and Architecture: "Following the Laws of Truth"]

[Text] Democratization, glasnost, and the establishment of new thinking have brought a breath of fresh air to the work of the USSR Committee for Lenin and State Prizes.

When discussing the works nominated for creative awards in 1987, it paid closer, more serious attention to opinions expressed at reader and viewer conferences, in letters sent to the committee by working people, and in newspaper and journal items. Creative discussions in the committee's six sections and at committee plenums were livelier. The committee is now free in its decisionmaking from the pressure which used to be exerted by influential officials and from the intolerance of some contenders and their biased friends. A common objective view is thereby reached, which is then backed up by a secret ballot, in which the contender has to collect no less than 75% of the vote. The committee has paid particularly close attention to the artistic achievements of the union republics, believing itself to be directly responsible for supporting and consolidating the successes of our multinational socialist culture. The number of USSR State Prizes awarded in 1987 comprises only one-third of the total number of works considered, which shows how intense the competition is.

The works awarded prizes in literature include the novel by V. Rasputin entitled "The Fire" [Pozhar]. Appearing soon after the April (1985) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the book clearly reveals the active, assertive stand taken by the author. The novel certainly confirms the acute need for renewal and restructuring at the very foundations of human, moral relations, which the party has turned toward.

The honest, impassioned novel by Yu. Mushketin, "The Frontier" [Rubezh], has a contemporary ring to it, the title reflecting the crucial nature of the time in which we live.

The inner world of the human mind fearlessly probing the age-old questions posed by life is revealed in Ye. Vinokurov's poetry anthologies entitled "Existence" [Bytiye] and "Hypostasis" [Ipostas]. Vital concern with the fatherland's long history, a feeling for the present, and thoughts on man's exalted destiny on earth throughout time are organically combined in the work of I. Shklyarevskiy and in his best work "I Listen to the Sky and the Earth" [Slushayu Nebo i Zemlyu].

Interest in our past has prompted the appearance of a large number of historical works. Preference was given to Yu. Davydov's "The Straw Lodge" [Solomennaya Storozhka], which offered the best combination of real historical analysis, artistic merit, and flair.

One more writer among the prize winners whom I take pleasure in naming is B. Bursov, the author of "Pushkin's Destiny" [Sudba Pushkina].

Some interesting work was also submitted in the cinematography section. An inner logic links the historical-biographical movies "Yu.V. Andropov. Pages From a Life" [Yu.V. Andropov. Stranitsy Zhizni] from the Central Documentary Film Studio and "Mikhail Romm. Confessions of a Movie Director" [Mikhail Romm. Ispoved Kinorezhissera] from the "Tsentrnauchfilm" Studio.

Among the many virtues of the feature movie "Games for Schoolchildren" [Igry dlya Detey Shkolnogo Vozrasta], in which Estonian moviemakers focus on the charges of children's homes, the main attribute is definitely the civic stand of the movie's creators, who focus our attention on an important social problem. The movie "Flights Real and Imagined" [Polety vo Sne i Nayavu] provoked a great deal of controversy. Its discussion in the committee was also marked by differences of opinion. It was pointed out, however, that its creators had succeeded in highlighting problem areas in our present-day conditions and convincingly revealing the circumstances whereby talented people are unable to show off their abilities and find themselves.

V. Vysotskiy's work has always met with a complex reaction. A man of unique talent, he gained nationwide recognition long before he was given official recognition. I think that the award of a posthumous prize to him for his role as Zheglov in the movie "The Rendezvous Cannot Be Changed" [Mesto Vstrechi Izmenit Nelzya] and for his performance of his own songs and ballads will, to a certain extent, restore justice toward this talented singer, poet, and performer.

A few words about theatrical works. M. Zakharov's many skills as a director are clearly apparent in the modern opera "'Juno' and 'Avos'" ["Yunona" i "Avos"], whose moral and philosophical is revealed by means of the musical-poetic metaphorical theater; his talent is also apparent in the drama-debate entitled "Dictatorship of Conscience" [Diktatura Sovesti], which is a political chronicle analyzing the nature of socialism and urging an uncompromising struggle against deviations from the Leninist norms of life. E. Nekroshyus, who has confidently made his way to the forefront of Soviet stage art, creates his own special artistic world with his fellow actors at the Lithuanian Youth Theater.

The creators of the opera "The Prophet" [Prorok] at the Sverdlovsk Academy Opera and Ballet Theater have achieved harmony between the musical and stage presentation, which is a feat not often accomplished.

An impressive artistic result has been achieved by Kh. Gadoyev, the first actor to play Oedipus in Sophocles' famous tragedy on the Tajik stage. N. Slichenko, director of the "Romen" Theater, was also among the prizewinners.

I am pleased to be able to name N. Durovaya among the prizewinners: She has continued the tradition of famous animal trainers and is the founder of the Animal Theater, renowned in many countries.

A prize has been awarded to the Turkmen composer Ch. Nurymov, whose music, while based on contemporary rhythms, draws charm and expression from the heart of his national culture. S. Sondetskis, conductor of the Lithuanian Chamber Orchestra, has established himself as a sensitive interpretor of the classics and a brilliant performer of modern compositions, primarily Soviet.

The art of G. Korzhev, People's Artist of the USSR, is deservedly famous. Humanism and love for his country, people, and the land link the heroes of his pictures "The Conversation," "Clouds in 1945," and "Don Quixote," which were all awarded creative prizes. The tapestry "People's Lives" is like a hymn to man the creator. The work of the Estonian artist E. Pyldroos, this original tapestry has become an integral part of the interior of the Tallin V.I. Lenin Palace of Sport and Culture.

Armenian architectural achievement is embodied in the Yerevan Sports-concert Complex, which represents a new type of multipurpose public building. The restoration of Tbilisi's historical sector offers an example of an innovative approach to the tasks of renovation.

The work of the new prizewinners is evidence of multinational Soviet culture's lively development. Animated by the truth of life, it contributes to society's revolutionary renewal and restructuring, which is continuing the Leninist task of creating a new world.

PRAVDA Notes Contents of Latest KOMMUNIST

PM201100 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Journal's Latest Issue"]

[Text] The latest, 17th issue of the journal *Kommunist* carries the report by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, entitled "October and Restructuring: The Revolution Continues," which was delivered at the joint ceremonial session of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet, and RSFSR Supreme Soviet to mark the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 2 November 1987.

"Leningrad in October" — that is the heading of a reportage describing the course of the restructuring in the city on the Neva.

Under the rubric "Science and Education," there are materials from a "roundtable" held by *Kommunist* in conjunction with the Novosibirsk CPSU Obkom and the presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department on problems of the development of science in Siberia. An article by G. Zavarzin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, is published under the heading "Global Problems and Microbiology." Under the rubric "Everything in Man — Everything for Man" an article by S. Fedorov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, "The Family Doctor in Alliance With the Computer," opens a discussion on improving the quality of health care.

Writer S. Dangulov's reflections, "Lenin, Genoa, the New Diplomacy," are devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Soviet diplomatic service.

The nature of the changes taking place in Chinese society is described in notes by philosopher V. Burov, who visited the PRC on a scientific mission.

Under the rubric "Our Abstracts," there is an account of the introductory section of the report of the International Commission on the Environment and Development, set up under UN auspices.

A letter from reader A. Ivanov on the quality of machinery for the countryside and a selection of responses to the item "A Nezhin Story" published in the journal's 13th issue are published.

The critical and bibliographical section contains reviews of books on October subjects.

Correction to Marchais Moscow Forum Address

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "French Communist Leader Addresses Moscow Forum," published in the 18 November Soviet Union *Daily Report*, pages 45-47: page 46, column two, paragraph four, line six reads: ...drawn from a 10% levy on arms spending... (inserting percent sign)

Agricultural

CPSU Central Committee on Agro-Industry

PM191429 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 87 Second Edition pp 2-3

[TASS report: "The Agro-Industrial Complex: Following a Course of Cooperative Production and Agro-Industrial Integration. Scientific and Practical Conference at the CPSU Central Committee"; passages in brackets supply differences in First Edition of same date]

[Text] A scientific and practical conference on organizational and economic problems of the further development of the country's agro-industrial complex was held at the CPSU Central Committee 18 November.

Taking part in the conference were secretaries of union republic Communist Party Central Committee and party kraykoms and obkoms, chairmen and specialists of the gosagroproms of union and autonomous republics and the agro-industrial committees of krays and oblasts, leaders of agro-industrial combines, agro-industrial associations, agro-industrial firms, scientific institutions, science-and-production and production systems, rayon agro-industrial associations, kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other enterprises and organizations of the agro-industrial complex, workers from a number of central ministries and departments, and representatives of the mass media.

On the presidium were CPSU Central Committee Politburo members V.I. Vorotnikov, Ye.K. Ligachev, and V.P. Nikonov, and CPSU Central Committee secretary G.P. Razumovskiy.

Ye.K. Ligachev opened the conference.

Our party and the Soviet people, he said, have passed an important milestone—the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The country greeted its jubilee in the midst of the revolutionary restructuring of all aspects of Soviet society's life. Man, with his interests and needs, has been placed at the center of practical policy.

A key question in tackling this policy is to ensure a stable supply of food to the country's population by increasing the efficiency of the agro-industrial complex. The social atmosphere in society, its cohesion, and socialism's prestige in the international arena depend largely on this.

These are the broad, general political positions on which the CPSU Central Committee operates in elaborating and organizing the implementation of the party's agrarian policy, which has been pursued particularly actively since April 1985. This is producing results. Average annual production in 1986-1987 as compared with average annual production in the 11th 5-Year Plan, for instance, increased as follows: grain by 17%, meat 12%, eggs 10%, and milk 9%. The growth in the production of output is ensured through intensive factors—the increase in the yield of agricultural crops and the productivity of animals.

However, in objectively assessing the state of affairs it should be noted that people's needs for varied, high-quality food products are not fully satisfied. It was not for nothing that the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum set a highly specific task—to change substantially the food supply situation in the current 5-year period [First Edition here has "in the next 2-3 years"]. Among the range of measures to fulfill this task, the CPSU Central Committee assigns the decisive role to the new economic mechanism and the restructuring of production relations in the agro-industrial complex.

What has actually been done in this direction in the period that has elapsed?

First, an integrated—from top to bottom, over the entire vertical range—organizational structure has been created for the management of agriculture and other associated sectors of the agro-industrial complex.

Second, unlike what used to happen in the past, when we used to change the structure but leave management methods as they were, this structure is now consistently backed up by the new economic mechanism. An important milestone along this path was the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on improving the economic mechanism of economic management in the country's agro-industrial complex, adopted in March of last year.

In September of this year a whole package of important party and government resolutions were adopted on urgent measures to accelerate the resolution of the food question and on the subsidiary farms of citizens and enterprises. [First Edition here has the following additional passage: "They define the means and time scale for switching kolkhozes and sovkhozes onto full economic accountability, lift unjustified restrictions on the development of subsidiary plots, and establish concessionary terms for state credits for them."]

The economic means and organizational forms are defined for radically improving scientific support for the agro-industrial complex. Investment policy is changing within the agro-industrial complex, in the direction of increasing funds for the storage and processing of agricultural raw materials, and large-scale measures are being implemented to retool the processing industry.

The CPSU Central Committee constantly keeps questions of agrarian policy in its field of vision and consistently tackles urgent problems. This is confirmed by the present scientific and practical conference on organizational and economic problems of the further development of the agro-industrial complex. It is planned to discuss two main questions—ways of developing new forms of management in the agro-industrial complex on the basis of cooperative production and agro-industrial integration and the transfer of enterprises to full economic accountability and self-financing.

These are complex and important questions, and at first glance they are diverse, but in essence they are organically interconnected and interdependent. Under socialism, democracy and the economy exist side by side, together, and influence each other profoundly. Economic mechanisms must in no circumstances be divorced from the development of socialist democracy. Transformations not only in the economic sphere, but also in the sociopolitical sphere will bring success to the policy of restructuring. That is the key question.

The formation of the agro-industrial complex and its management organs is undoubtedly a major step forward in coordinating forces and resources. But in many cases a mechanical amalgamation of agro-industrial services has taken place, retaining a significant proportion of departmental interests which are not oriented toward achieving the maximum production of output while cutting costs. New management organs have begun to spring up at rayon level.

Agro-industrial combines, agro-industrial associations, agro-industrial firms, science-and-production and production systems, various forms of economic accountability relations and the collective contract—these are genuinely new phenomena in our agrarian economy. Lenin's proposition on combining personal, collective, and state interests is here put into practice.

The advantages of new forms of combining farming and industry and managing agro-industrial production may be characterized as follows.

First, they ensure real integration, a unified process of production of agricultural produce, purchases, storage, processing, and the sale of finished food products. Thus departmental barriers of not only an organizational nature, but also an economic nature are eliminated in practice, and not only unity of interests, but also unity of action by each participant and the formation as a whole are ensured, as well as their mutual interest in and mutual responsibility for the production and delivery to the stores of the largest possible quantity of the end product—food. [First Edition here has following additional passage: "By virtue of the fact that the economic condition of an association and the farms and enterprises belonging to it, and equally the material prosperity of workers in the agro-industrial complex, depend on the sale of a significant proportion of output directly to the consumer through the stores, concern for the processing of raw materials and the quality of food products is increased. Questions of improving the quality of agricultural raw materials and food products constantly become more urgent and relevant."]

Second, they create more favorable conditions for the wide introduction of the achievements of scientific and technical progress into production.

Third, a situation in which the material prosperity of the labor collectives of agro-industrial formations and the resolution of their social problems depend entirely on the sale of the end product makes it possible and inevitable for production to be organized on the principles of true economic accountability and self-financing.

Fourth, in agro-industrial combines and especially in agro-industrial associations like the "Novomoskovskoye" in Tula Oblast, the management of production is carried out by truly democratic means, in the common interest. Here a different kind of management apparatus was needed. The apparatus was cut considerably and became more flexible, cheaper, and more efficient.

Last, agro-industrial associations of the new type and agro-industrial combines are a successful form of combination of the territorial and sector principles of management.

While creating the new type of organs of management of the agro-industrial complex within the framework of the rayons, we should set about improving management structures on kolkhozes and sovkhozes and at other enterprises. Often there is not enough democratization and glasnost in management, and the labor collectives suffer great economic and moral losses as a result.

A few thoughts on the transition to full economic accountability and self-financing. It must be explained clearly and firmly to everyone that the switch to full, genuine economic accountability and self-financing is a concrete manifestation of the further democratization of the economy of the agro-industrial complex. Many economic questions whose resolution was formerly concentrated at central and other higher organs are now being handed over to the labor collectives. In this context, unless interference in their areas of competence and encroachment on the rights of enterprises and labor collectives are abandoned forever, there can be no economic accountability and self-financing. It is becoming clear that not only rayon organs, but also oblast, kray, and republican organs must go over to an economic accountability basis, and labor remuneration must be made to depend on the economic activity of the enterprises and associations of the agro-industrial complex.

There is also a need to draw attention to another aspect of this question, which many people either forget about or underestimate. It is a question not only of compliance with the rights of enterprises and labor collectives, but also of their economic responsibility for the results of their work. Without this responsibility, once again there can be no question of economic accountability and self-financing. And these fears are not unfounded.

On farms in Ivanovo, Bryansk, and certain other oblasts, for instance, in recent years labor remuneration has clearly not taken into account the workers' real contribution to production, and in many cases the wage fund exceeds gross income. With such parasitic inclinations, such a consumerist mentality, there is no point even thinking about economic accountability and self-financing.

[First Edition here has the following additional passage: "Speaking of the transfer of economically backward farms and other enterprises of the agro-industrial complex to economic accountability and self-financing, the speaker stressed that the time scale for the transfer is defined by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution—it is planned to transfer the country's entire agro-industrial complex and all its enterprises to full economic accountability and self-financing from 1989."]

As for loss-making and low-profit farms, for them, Ye.K. Ligachev stressed, economic accountability is even more necessary than for the leading, economically strong farms, which, incidentally, in fact became strong because of economic accountability.

But the transfer of these farms requires [First Edition here has following additional passage: "...more preparatory work and some organizational and material assistance, if only initially. It requires..."] more attention on the part of management organs, and particularly the party committees. They must, finally, ensure that such farms and enterprises are reinforced with leader and specialist cadres whose ability to operate in the conditions of economic accountability and self-financing can be confidently relied on. That is the main, decisive factor.

One last thing. The experience accumulated in the country in agro-industrial integration and cooperative production and in transferring enterprises of the agro-industrial complex to full economic accountability and self-financing merits keen study and generalization, objective evaluation, and serious scientific and practical analysis.

A report "On Measures To Accelerate the Increase in the Country's Food Resources on the Basis of the Development of Agro-Industrial Integration, Cooperative Production, and the Transfer of Enterprises to Full Economic Accountability and Self-Financing" was delivered by V.P. Nikonov.

Through the efforts of the party and the whole people, he stressed, in recent years it has been possible to a significant degree to overcome stagnation phenomena in agriculture and ensure an increase in production. On average in 1986-1987 compared with the average annual level in the last 5-year plan, the sector's gross output increased by nearly 10%. The average annual gross grain harvest in that period exceeded 210 million tonnes, and the increase over the 11th 5-Year Plan level was 17%. The production of meat increased by 1.9 million tonnes, milk by 8.5 million tonnes, and egg production by 7.2 billion. The food and processing industry, developing in an integrated complex with agriculture, have improved their activity. These sectors' enterprises increased their average annual production from R115.2 billion in the 11th 5-Year Plan to R123.9 billion in 1986-1987, an increase of 7.5%.

The new procedure for forming the food stocks intended for local supplies has been received with satisfaction in the oblasts, krays, and republics [First Edition here has:"in the localities"]. Firm plans for centralized deliveries and volumes of subsidies have literally freed the hands of the local organs to improve supplies to the population by increasing their own production of output. Where people have rapidly grasped the nature of the changes and really made use of the opportunities offered, considerable reserves have emerged for supplementing food resources. This is clearly shown by the experience of the Belorussian SSR and Orel, Belgorod, Kuybyshev, Tomsk, Poltava, Cherkassy, and a number of other oblasts.

The positive developments achieved in the agro-industrial complex system in a short period give us the right to say with good grounds that the restructuring is gathering speed in this sphere of the economy. But it is still only a beginning. At the present crucial stage of the restructuring new efforts are needed, the most resolute measures, to fulfill the tasks set by the 27th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum. Among these tasks, as is known, the task of achieving a significant improvement in the country's food supplies in 2-3 years is brought to the fore. All the objective conditions for this exist. But they must be fully utilized and potential must be translated into reality.

Unfortunately, party organizations, soviet and economic organs, and leaders and specialists at kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agro-industrial complex enterprises and organizations in many republics, krays, and oblasts have hitherto failed to take full advantage of the real conditions created by the new mechanism of economic management.

In order to ensure a tangible improvement in the supply of basic foodstuffs to Soviet people over the next few years, it is necessary to increase the country's per capita meat production in 1988-1990 by at least 7 kg, while growth in the last 3 years (1985-1987) amounted to just 2 kg. The growth of per capita consumption of vegetable oils must be increased by 2.5 kg against 0.4 kg [First Edition has "1.2 kg"] during the previous 3 years, that of fruit and berries by 28 kg against 11 kg, and that of vegetables and melon crops by 38 kg against their unchanged level of consumption in the last few years. It is also necessary to ensure further growth of the production and consumption of milk and dairy products.

One of the most complex and crucial tasks is to ensure steady growth of grain production. Grain crop yields on every farm must increase by at least 5 quintals. An equally acute problem is to increase the productivity of fields sown to other crops. The yield of oil-producing crops must increase by 7-8 quintals, that of sugar beet by 50-60 quintals, and that of raw cotton by 1 tonne per hectare. It is necessary to radically change virtually everywhere attitudes toward the utilization of feed crop fields and the production of high quality feeds which are fully balanced in terms of protein and carbohydrate content. The growth rate of gross output from the agro-industrial complex must increase by 50% during the remaining years of the 5-year plan period and by 150% during the next 5-year plan period against the level achieved during the first 4 years following the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) Plenum.

Now, when it is necessary to choose the most correct path to achieve these goals, when, at the new stage of restructuring, our entire policy and all our decisions are being translated into specific deeds and are being implemented, it is appropriate to cite V.I. Lenin's words. Socialist society, he wrote, must be built "...not on enthusiasm alone, but with the help of enthusiasm engendered by the great revolution, on the basis of personal interest, personal commitment, and economic accountability [khozyaystvennyy raschet]." He warned sternly against the impermissibility of turning cooperative or state property into "no one's property" under any organizational transformations. [First Edition omits "under any organizational transformations."] Applied to the present, this means a substantiated combination of the personal, collective, and general state interests of the peasants, social production, and personal subsidiary farming. The way to this lies through collective, family, and rental contracts, economic accountability, and remuneration of labor from gross income.

No other task in all organizational and political work [First Edition omits "in all organizational and political work"] by party committees and agro-industrial organs today is more important than the development of people's creative initiative and [First Edition omits "the development of people's creative initiative and"] the creation of a moral and psychological atmosphere and of economic conditions in labor collectives whereby every working person who has adopted the new way of working feels a genuine master of his affairs.

Various contractual forms of labor organization and incentives have been tested by time. The speaker cited specific examples to demonstrate their great fruitfulness. Given a correct and well thought-out approach toward the organization of contractual collectives, it is possible to solve within the briefest of time periods a whole range of pressing questions concerning food supplies. This is proved in particular by the experience of I.I. Askanov's contractual link from the Tatar ASSR's "Ovoshchevod" Sovkhoz. Six people cultivated carrots on 270 hectares and harvested 376 quintals from each hectare. The total crop amounted to 10,152 tonnes worth R1,752,000. [Here First Edition adds: "Each worker produced output worth R290,000."] But something else is important: This quantity of carrots can virtually satisfy all the needs of public catering enterprises in the entire autonomous republic.

We all know the urgent problem existing as regards supplying people with fruit and berries, tomatoes, and other fruit and vegetable produce. In order to solve this problem, large funds are being invested in the construction of specialized farms and hothouse combines. But the potential of family contracts is utilized far from everywhere and far from fully, and the experience already accumulated in this work is not being disseminated. Resident of many rayons in Ternopol Oblast, for example, grow potatoes for themselves on public land with the approval of farm leaderships, as well as tomatoes and berries in truck gardens under contracts with the farms. This year, 620 families on Kremenetskiy Rayon's "Druzhba" Kolkhoz grew strawberries under family contracts. They produced 500 tonnes of berries, earning R662,000. The rayon as a whole purchased over 2,000 tonnes of berries from the population.

You would have thought that all rural party organizations would quickly get down to disseminating this kind of experience, which makes it possible to build up food supply resources swiftly without any special capital costs. But this has yet to happen. This experience has not been duly applied even in Ukrainian oblasts neighboring on Ternopol Oblast.

An equally important problem is to enlist the rich potential of collective, family, and individual contracts in the work to boost the efficiency of potato and feed tuber cultivation. This is already being done, and quite fruitfully, moreover, in many rayons of Belorussia, the Baltic republics, and in Moscow, Leningrad, and some other oblasts. In other regions, however, matters are progressing slowly and timidly. Meanwhile, hundreds of thousands of hectares of public land sown to these crops, especially in the RSFSR's Non-Chernozem Zone and Kazakhstan, are inefficiently utilized.

The speaker emphasized in particular [First Edition has "with particular urgency"] the pressing need to transfer collectives using reclaimed land to contractual forms of labor organization and production. At present this land produces less than half the planned yield in Central Asian republics. In Kirghizia, for example, 60 quintals of grain corn are now harvested on irrigated land. Again in Kirghizia, however, and in identical conditions, K. Moydunov's family contract link on Osh Oblast's "Yassy" Sovkhoz has raised yields from 60 hectares to 150 quintals, while A. Askarov's link on the "Shurab-Basha" Sovkhoz has raised it to 152 quintals. The introduction of these collectives' experience everywhere would mean doubling the republic's grain corn production without increasing the area.

The speaker went on to analyze the causes of the slow dissemination of accumulated experience. In this context he noted the main retardants.

First, the existing economic mechanism in its present form has proved unreceptive to the collective contract. Its efficiency is seriously diminished through the absence of genuine economic accountability on farms as a whole.

Second, many leaders and specialists are unwilling and at times unable to work in the new fashion. Consequently, they often not only fail to promote the assimilation of contracts and economic accountability but also offer covert and at times [First Edition omits "at times"] even overt resistance.

Attempts to reduce earnings or to effect savings on earnings must be blocked by all means. Only one thing can limit remuneration growth: Its correspondence with labor productivity levels and end results of production. For example, the Petyayev family on the "Zavety Ilicha" Kolkhoz in Moscow Oblast's Krasnogorskiy Rayon earns approximately R500 per worker per month by rearing young animals. In this period it supplies the kolkhoz with output worth over R14,000, and a total of 18% of the gross income generated is channeled into wages. Just two peoples—husband and wife—look after 220 animals. Another, identical stock unit employs six persons incurring monthly wage costs of R1,200, while the output produced per worker amounts to R2,000, in other words 70% less.

Specific labor results and savings of funds must be encouraged. We must not slide back to the old positions, when wage leveling flourished. But such instances are allowed to occur even in contractual conditions. In Alma-Ata Oblast, for example, 660 contractual subunits were credited with cost savings of more than R25 million according to last year's results, but the actual payments they received amounted to only R255,000, in other words less than 1% instead of 70. At the same time, 735 collectives incurred cost overruns of R50 million, and the amount recouped from them was only R180,000.

Contracts are still spreading slowly in rural construction organizations, and yet they were among the initiators of this progressive work.

Some oblast and republic agro-industrial organs and even party committees tolerate bad workmanship by construction industry workers and are failing to take resolute measures to activate this important section of the agro-industrial complex. Yet this is the sphere where the bulk of financial and material resources are spent. High returns can be ensured only as a result of prompt commissioning of planned projects and the proper circulation of funds and resources. Meanwhile, construction industry workers and local organ leaders at agro-industrial construction sites are to blame for the very slow decline of "work in hand," the still high number of construction schedule overruns, and the lack of improvement in economic indicators.

The situation is particularly bad at rural construction sites in the Georgian, Azerbaijan, and Moldavian SSR's and in Kursk, Kemerovo, Uralsk, Dzhizak, Astrakhan, Ivanovo, Novgorod, and several other oblasts. A grain products combine in Tobolsk, Tyumen Oblast, has been under construction for 13 years. A malt plant in Slavuta, Khmelnitskiy Oblast, has been under construction for 9 years, corn processing plants in the Kabardino-Balkar and Chechen-Ingush ASSR's have been under construction for more than 5 years, and the House of Culture at the Yegoryevsk poultry factory, Moscow Oblast, has been under construction for 10 years. Imported equipment worth millions of rubles has been lying idle for several years now at the construction site of the Pogar potato products plant, Bryansk Oblast, while construction industry workers have just about completed the preparatory work.

The task in the sphere of rural capital construction, the speaker went on to say, is to ensure the utmost concentration of resources and funds on the most important areas and projects scheduled for commissioning, and the collective contract offers broad opportunities for resolving it.

Contracts are dynamic things. Practice offers living examples of improvements to their forms and mechanism literally before our very eyes. Production collectives have emerged in a number of rayons which rent means of production for long periods (10-15 years) and are genuine masters of the land. All subunits on the Manshuk Memetova Sovkhoz in Tselinograd Oblast work on rental contracts. Over a 3-year period output and grain crop yields have increased threefold with an equal increase in labor productivity, and the sovkhoz has turned from a loss-making into a highly profitable enterprise.

The level of assimilation of contractual forms of labor organization and economic accountability, in close combination with the intensification of production, must become the most important criterion for assessing the performance of party, soviet, and economic organs and the entire progress of restructuring within the agro-industrial complex. It is necessary to ensure that every field, stock unit, and team section has a proper and solicitous steward over a long-term period. It is here that the terms "restructuring and acceleration" acquire a profound meaning. This is the path that leads to significant labor productivity growth, the reduction of costs, high returns from invested funds, and significant growth in production efficiency.

At the same time it is necessary to guard against formalism and unsystematic campaigns in this important work. No one, and least of all the peasant on the land, needs a transition to contractual forms of labor organization "just for the record." Unfortunately, there are many such cases. The percentage of contract "introduction" in Bryansk Oblast, for example, is high, but the expected results have yet to appear. According to official figures, 87% of farm subunits have switched to internal economic accountability and 54% are covered by all sorts of contracts, but grain crop and potato yields in some rayons are below the levels of 10 years ago and the milk yield per cow is just over 2,000 kg. As regards profitability, it has fallen from 18.4% in 1983 to 2% in 1986, while the number of loss-making kolkhozes and sovkhozes has risen from 83 to 211.

All party, soviet, and economic workers involved in the agrarian sphere must get it firmly in their minds that, without the proper major step [First Edition has "transition" instead of "the proper major step"] toward progressive forms of labor organization and incentives, without a qualitatively new step [First Edition omits "without a qualitatively new step"], it will be difficult to resolve the task of further improving the efficiency of the economic mechanism and management and of switching all agro-industrial complex enterprises to full economic accountability and self-financing. And mainly to ensure guaranteed growth of the output of foodstuffs. [First Edition omits last sentence]

The foundations for transition to qualitatively new conditions of economic management in the country have been laid. A CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on the improvement of the economic management mechanism and the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) have been adopted. Organizational and economic measures have been planned.

Work on the implementation of a radical economic reform, as it was stressed in the report to the ceremonial session devoted to the 70th anniversary of October, must be subordinated to ensuring the deepening of our system's inherent democratic principles of management, founded primarily on economic methods and optimal combination of centralism and self-management. This stipulation also applies fully to the agro-industrial complex.

Much has been done here in the last few years. The agro-industrial complex is the only sphere in our economy where a system of intersector management organs from top to bottom has been created. But the situation must be objectively assessed. What has been basically ensured is just the organizational-legal unification of all its components, while real economic unity has not yet been successfully achieved. In practical terms, the components of the agro-industrial complex have yet to become a unified interlinked mechanism.

The task now is to move on further and deeper, to ensure effective integration of all agro-industrial complex sectors and spheres, and to concentrate the efforts of labor collectives and management organs not on interim indicators but on the achievement of high end results, in this way to activate the potential of the new management system more fully at all levels.

The shortcomings in the economic management mechanism appear most clearly at the rayon level of management. When the present management system was taking shape, it was intended that the rayon agro-industrial association council would be a democratic organ expressing the interests of all enterprises and farms and ensuring the necessary conditions for their efficient work. In actual fact, the majority of rayon agro-industrial association councils remained just administrative organs which continue to exhort kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other enterprises.

Is there an alternative? Yes, there is. In Latvia and Estonia, in Stavropol Kray, and in Volgograd, Rostov, and some other oblasts there have been fundamental changes in the status, functions, and rights of rayon agro-industrial associations. Council chairmen there are elected from among the most authoritative farm leaders. The council enjoys the right to determine the structure, staffing level, and functions of the apparatus, which is accountable to the council and operates, figuratively speaking, "on hire" and implements its decisions.

The majority of transformed rayon agro-industrial associations have not been functioning long, and it would be wrong now to ascribe their preliminary good work results just to the restructuring of management. But something else is important—in these rayons changes for the better have become clearly apparent in the management of agro-industrial production. They enable us to conclude that the democratic restructuring of the management mechanism is vital and promising.

The agro-industrial associations being set up in a number of parts of the country, like Tula Oblast's "Novomoskovskoye," merit all possible support. The keynote speaker noted the fundamental peculiarity of this formation, where not only management of the association as a whole but also its entire internal organizational structure are founded on cooperative principles. The main subdivisions there are four specialized cooperatives—crop production, meat and dairy, production-technical, and planning and construction. Each of these cooperatives has an independent balance sheet and a current account and a loan account at the association's unified financial-accounting center, is endowed with the rights of a legal entity, and works under conditions of full economic accountability and self-financing.

It is also an important fact that the obligations of the administrative and managerial apparatus of the farms, enterprises, and organizations making up the association were also carefully thought out in the process of setting up the association. As a result, it was considered expedient to reduce the administrative and managerial personnel by 350 people, or by almost one-third.

Agro-industrial combines like the "Kuban" are becoming widespread. There are now more than 50 of them. Profound integration of agriculture with the processing industry has been achieved in them. This naturally makes it possible to make better use of raw materials and to ensure the thorough processing of products. As a result, not only do losses diminish and food resources increase but also direct growth in income is achieved and their economies strengthen.

The new conditions of economic activity in agrocombines have given rise to active questing not only in the production sphere but also in organizing the most efficient methods of delivering and selling products to the consumers. The "Kuban" agrocombine, for example, already has 20 permanent stores and 11 public catering enterprises. This year alone their network has expanded by 50 percent. The combine has its own stores and cafes in Krasnodar, Sochi, Gelendzhik, and Novorossiysk. Over 70 more trading pavilions are opened during the period of mass sales of fruit and vegetable products.

The "Ramenskiy" Combine near Moscow [First Edition omits "near Moscow"] incorporates all the vegetable stores in the capital's Pervomayskiy Rayon, where more than 400,000 people live, and has opened its own stores in the cities of Ramenskoye and Zhukovskiy. The combine's commodity turnover will exceed R31 million this year.

There is much that is new in the party leadership of enterprises and organizations of the new agro-industrial associations and combines. Instances of the supplanting of economic leaders, of petty tutelage of them, and of unjustified interference in production activity have essentially been ruled out there. Party raykoms and gorkoms focus their attention on work with cadres and on organizing their studies and enhancing responsibility for the assigned task.

Only the first stage has been traversed in developing new formations of the agro-industrial complex at rayon level. But it has already brought to light many negative phenomena, which are slowing the normal development of an important process. A number of ministries and departments are doing their utmost to prevent their subordinate enterprises and organizations which already belong to rayon agro-industrial complexes from being incorporated in the combines, and without them an integral system of the production, processing, and sales of products cannot be created. The material and technical supplies to combines also require substantial improvement.

The agro-industrial committees of certain autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts violate the rights granted to combines in organizing their trading activity and do not leave them the necessary resources of agricultural products for sale through their own trade network.

It is the task of local party, soviet, and economic organs to ensure that the new formations have the necessary conditions for productive work and for the fuller realization of their potential.

At the same time, in developing the process of integrating the production, processing, and sale of products, we should not confine ourselves just to setting up agrocombines and associations. At the contemporary stage the organic combining of production and product processing can and must be developed directly on kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Such experience exists. Dozens of sovkhoz-plants and kolkhoz-plants have been set up and are functioning successfully. In recent years shops and entire enterprises for the processing of various kinds of agricultural products have begun to be developed on farms at an accelerated rate. But this process becomes really efficient and assumes a large scale when agrofirms are set up.

The example of Latvia's "Adazhi" kolkhoz-agrofirm is instructive. They began there with what seemed a simple matter. The kolkhoz grows a lot of potatoes. The farm used to receive R125,000 per 1,000 tonnes when selling them in unprocessed form. Profitability was low—25-27%. The farm organized processing of the potatoes to produce starch, potato sticks [solomka], and other products ready to use. The proceeds from sales rose to R600,000 per 1,000 tonnes, and profitability reached 44%. Other areas of the processing of agricultural raw materials and the production of a whole series of finished foodstuffs are also being developed widely on the farm now. Output worth R45 million was sold there during 1986.

Agrofirms like "Adazhi" are already operating in a whole number of Latvian, Estonian, and Ukrainian rayons. They are also spreading in certain RSFSR oblasts.

Practice convinces us, and life insistently demands, that subsidiary industrial production facilities should be widely developed on kolkhozes and sovkhozes, with a view not just to processing products but also to creating various businesses. This makes it possible to resolve an entire package of questions of the countryside's socio-economic development. Kolkhoz and sovkhoz incomes are growing, their economies are strengthening, people's employment and earnings are increasing, and the sphere of application of labor is expanding, particularly for young people. All this is helping to enhance the prestige of work and life in the countryside and to get cadres to stay there.

A very important task in improving management is to orient it toward accelerating scientific and technical progress. Without this it is impossible to develop production efficiently either now or, still less, in the future. We are making a great effort to introduce scientific and technical achievements into practice but, given the existing organizational forms, this work has not produced the necessary effect, above all, because it has been carried out from above and, as it were, has been imposed on farms without proper interest and initiative on their part.

The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have deemed it necessary to radically restructure work in this sphere. The recent conference on questions of scientific support for the agro-industrial complex approved [First Edition has "decided to accelerate" instead of "approved"] the creation of new organizational forms of the introduction of scientific and technical progress based on democratic principles and cooperative production and on voluntariness and the initiative and interest of farms.

This work, too, is not being developed in a vacuum. Science-and-production associations and science-and-production and production systems are already operating in various parts of the country. There are substantial differences between these formations but, at the same time, they are united by common principles. First, the close combination of science with practice, which makes it possible to shorten the path of scientific developments to their broad introduction. Second, contract cooperative ties among partners, which ensure mutual, economically accountable interest and responsibility.

Horticultural and viticultural science-and-production associations that are widely known in the country—the Uzbek SSR's R.R. Shreder Association, the Moldavian SSR's "Gibrid," "Selektsiya," and "Dnestr" Associations, and the Ukrainian SSR's "Dnepr" and "Efirmaslo" Associations—set an example of high efficiency. There are also the science-and-production systems for rape in Lipetsk and Ivano-Frankovsk Oblasts, for the production of corn hybrids in Dnepropetrovsk and Kurgan Oblasts, for alfalfa seeds in the Chechen-ingush ASSR, and others. In all, there are now 100 science-and-production systems and approximately 80 production systems.

The "Pridvinskaya" science-and-production system for pork production in Vitebsk Oblast is interesting because, unlike the majority of formations of this kind, it embraces practically the entire sector in the oblast. It incorporates the "Zadneprovskiy" Pedigree Livestock Sovkhoz, a hybrid-selection center, an experimental plant for production of specialized mixed feed, nonstandard equipment and construction and repair enterprises, a planning and design bureau, a technological bureau, a cadre-training combine, and also 26 specialized kolkhozes and sovkhozes. An introduction [vnedrencheskiy] group of specialist technologists has been set up to give the farms effective assistance. The system organizes its activity on the basis of contract relations. In addition, noncommodity livestock units will operate on all kolkhozes and sovkhozes to obtain products for their own needs and to raise and sell piglets to the population.

The "Stavropolskoye" Broiler Association has been working on principles of self-capitalization and self-financing since 1983. All 15 poultry factories and pedigree stock farms, 6 poultry combines, 4 construction and installation administrations, and other subdivisions operate under conditions of full economic accountability. The ultimate goal of each of them and of the association as a whole is to achieve a highly efficient economic result expressed in obtaining the maximum quantity of high-quality products which make the highest profit against a constant reduction in production costs.

All internal farm subdivisions work, as a rule, under contract. Their relationship with the management is based on contracts with a high level of independence in resolving economic questions. To this end wide use is made of production computerization and programming, and internal farm accounting prices have been introduced. The association operates a system of labor remuneration and encouragement for its workers, including all leaders and specialists, according to the quantity and quality of the products produced.

The introduction of progressive technologies and of thorough product processing, the extension of the range of products produced, and the organization of extensive own-brand trade have become an important factor in enhancing production profitability. This year the enterprises are producing 50 different products, while it is planned to produce more than 100 different ones by 1990. During the 1st 9 months of this year the association made approximately R8 million of additional profit.

An extensive program to improve housing, cultural, and domestic conditions is being implemented at the association's enterprises, exclusively at their own expense. During the last 5-year plan alone 35,500 square meters of housing were constructed for the workers, as were 5 kindergartens with 700 places, and more than R18 million, in all, was assimilated on sociocultural and consumer projects.

The "Stavropolskoye" Broiler Production Association's experience shows that, with profitability of 17-20% and a large amount of profit, the rational running of the farm is ensured at its own expense, without help from the state budget. The profitability of the majority of the country's poultry enterprises exceeds this level, and therefore there is good reason to transfer all industrial poultry farming to self-capitalization and self-financing. In the RSFSR [First Edition omits "In the RSFSR"] only 20 former [First Edition omits "former"] poultry industry administration trusts have now been transferred to these conditions, production associations have been created on their basis, and their work experience confirms in practice the sensible combination of sectorial and territorial management.

The USSR Gosagroprom, the keynote speaker emphasized, [First Edition omits "the keynote speaker emphasized"] must not just transform trusts [First Edition has ...transform existing trusts...] into associations but endow them with the rights that the Stavropol formation has. It is also necessary to transfer processing enterprises to them, open own-brand stores everywhere, considerably extend the range of products produced, and more fully satisfy the population's needs for them.

It is clear from all that has been said that the basic guidelines for the democratization of management and the in-depth integration of agro-industrial production at the level of farms, rayons, and entire specialized sectors have been defined in the country. Effective forms for introducing the achievements of science and advanced practice into this sphere have also been found. The aim now is to make this process large in scale and to accelerate the pace of its development. However, due attention is not being shown to the new agro-industrial formations everywhere. To date there is not a single agricultural combine in Altay Kray, Kemerovo and Perm Oblasts, or Turkmenia, Tajikistan, and Moldavia. No measures have been taken to organize science-and-producton systems in Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, many oblasts in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, and other republics, and that is still the case.

The reason is the same: the underrating of progressive forms for the transformation of production on the part of local soviet and economic organs, their inertia, and the lack of a sense of innovation on the part of many workers. Party committees must take the control of the organization of this work into their own hands.

As for problems relating to the transfer of enterprises in the agro-industrial complex to full economic accountability and self-financing, the speaker noted the importance of careful preparation for this work. In Stavropol Kray, for example, the switch to self-financing was preceded by an extensive discussion of the problem at party kraykom and raykom plenums, at kolkhoz and sovkhoz primary party organization meetings, and at sessions of rayon soviets.

The introduction of the new economic mechanism began with the restructuring of people's consciousness and with their mastering of the essence of the new economic management conditions. Cadre training has become a priority here. Scientific-practical economic conferences and seminars have been held in all rural rayons and in the kray and the base farms have been identified, where regular classes are being held now involving rayon agro-industrial association workers, party organization leaders and secretaries, and farm main specialists.

Much preparatory economic work has been done at the same time as cadre training. Scientists together with practical workers have devised a methodology for determining price supplements, proposals for changing the existing procedure of planning, finance, credit, and workers' material incentives, and other normative documents.

Of course, the switch to full economic accountability by all enterprises at republic, kray, oblast, and rayon level is no easy matter and a whole package of organizational, economic, and other measures must be implemented to resolve the problem.

The USSR Gosagroprom, in conjunction with the USSR Gosplan and other departments, has prepared a draft government resolution on the transfer of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agro-industrial complex enterprises in a number of republics and oblasts to full economic accountaibility and self-financing. The draft envisages the creation of the necessary financial start-up conditions [First Edition omits "start-up"] for all farms and the transfer to normative methods of planning and material and technical support for enterprises' production activity in accordance with the state order for output supply.

It is planned to comprehensively develop the initiative, independence, and resourcefulness of enterprise leaders and specialists in economic activity as well as in the sale of a wider range of fresh and processed produce at agreed prices. It is planned to intensify the production and economic thrust of rayon agro-industrial associations as the basic link in the management of the agro-industrial complex on democratic principles. It has been decided that all questions related to the placing of state orders, the transfer of control figures, and the formation of the structure, staffs, and expenditure on the upkeep of the management apparatus excluding their registration with financial organs are to come within the sole competence of the association council.

The USSR Gosagroprom and its local organs have much work to do to transfer enterprises and organizations in the agro-industrial complex to full economic accountability and self-financing and to ensure the interlinking of indicators, normatives, and quotas. They are to establish constant monitoring of the preparation of enterprises and organizations for work in the new conditions and should give them effective help in resolving the questions that occur. Particular attention is to be paid to developing and deepening intrafarm accounting and the team and family contract and economic levers and incentives must be used to achieve high end results.

The resolution of the party's practical tasks of transferring to economic mangement methods depends to a great extent on the level of management today. On many kolkhozes and sovkhozes now production is extremely extensive in approach, field and livestock productivity is low, and material and labor resources are not being used rationally. Large nonproduction costs and losses are being incurred.

There are still [First Edition omits "still"] quite a few farms which have to all intents and purposes not introduced a cost-cutting mechanism, where parasitism has not been eradicated, and where the bulk of the money obtained from raising purchase prices and supplements is spent not on developing production and strengthening the economy but on unjustifiably raising pay.

It is necessary in the light of the concrete conditions to draw up a system of measures for each farm ensuring the strengthening of its economy and the management of expanded reproduction using its own resources.

The credit system needs radical restructuring. It is necessary to restore the economic accountability functions that it has lost. [First Edition omits previous two sentences] Many kolkhozes and sovkhozes have become so accustomed to credits and various supplements, sometimes simply to outright gifts, that they can conceive of no other way of life. On the overwhelming majority of farms, credit has essentially become unrecoverable and has lost the nature inherent to it since time immemorial when it was used to accelerate circulation and to increase the return on resources in the social reproduction system.

The banking system is being changed in connection with the transfer to economic accountability. An Agroprombank has been set up and is beginning to operate and its status contains a fundamentally new approach to credit provision. It is to function as an economically accountable organization, it must not be an "automatic" money dispenser, registrar, or monitor but be [First Edition has "become" instead of "be"] a reliable economic partner closely coordinating its activity with the economic work of agro-industrial complex enterprises. It is envisaged that the Agroprombank will issue credits primarily to those who guarantee to use them efficiently and repay them on time.

The switch to economic accountability raises major new tasks in the planning sphere, too. The strategic course here is a familiar one—the all-around expansion of enterprises' independence and the wide use of economic normatives and levers. This line has been enshrined and given concrete form in the materials of the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum and the Law on the State Enterprise (Association). Beginning next year, control figures, state orders, and economic normatives and quotas will be conveyed to enterprises.

To enable the new planning system to begin operating to full effect it is necessary to radically improve the work of preparing and assimilating long-term economic normatives and quotas. This is one of the priority tasks now facing the USSR Gosagroprom and its scientific institutions.

The entire system of economic accountability is geared to increasing the interest and responsibility of enterprises' collectives for the whole production process. At the same time the demands on the organization of labor remuneration and need to reinforce its dependence on end results are increasing immensely. As practical experience shows, labor remuneration based on gross income is the best answer to that problem. This system of labor remuneration is to go into effect on all farms in the agro-industrial complex system as of 1 January next year.

The most complex, the most difficult question in the transfer to the new conditions of economic management is the solution of the problem of farms making either a loss or only a small profit.

There are various reasons for the laggardness of economically weak farms. They are to do with inferior objective conditions of production management and the low standard of economic management. This must be taken into account during the changeover to economic accountability. There must be an individual approach to each farm of that type.

Party committees and agro-industrial organs must base their work aimed at eliminating the laggardness of loss- and low profit-making agro-industrial complex enterprises on the demands of the CPSU Central Committee resolution on urgent measures to accelerate the solution of the food question. They are concerned primarily with reinforcing laggard kolkhozes and sovkhozes with experienced cadres of leaders and specialists, creating the conditions necessary to their work, and preventing unwarranted staff turnover. The recruitment to such enterprises of the best cadres, capable of leading people and helping farms out of their difficulties, must be considered the main task facing party committees.

It is also necessary to choose the right area of specialization and production activity of such farms, to give them effective assistance in strengthening the production base and in building housing, roads, and production and cultural-consumer facilities, and to launch the wide-scale sponsorship of laggard farms by advanced farms, including help in the form of workers, equipment, and specialists, and the leasing of land. Weak farms may be assigned for a long period to industrial enterprises and organizations so that they can invest their own resources in developing the economy, increase production, and make full or partial use of agricultural output to improve the supply to workers' collectives. In some instances laggard kolkhozes, sovkhozes, or their subunits should be transferred to industrial enterprises for subsidiary plots to be organized on their basis.

There must be a concrete plan of measures to develop laggard farms at rayon, oblast, and republic level, and its fulfillment must be monitored most strictly.

The transfer to the new methods of economic management requires the corresponding cadre backup and a fundamental organizational, economic, and psychological restructuring. And it must begin with people, leaders, specialists, and all workers and with the shaping of the new economic thinking. This is the paramount and most crucial task facing party committees and agro-industrial committees and associations.

Its urgency is due to the fact that by no means all leaders and specialists of agro-industrial complex enterprises today have mastered economic methods of management and cadres in the mass trades have not assimilated advanced experience or progressive techniques.

Life does not stand still, and practice, which is developing dynamically, raises more and more new problems. The transition to the new economic methods of management, economic accountability, and self-financing raises to a whole new level the demands on the level of skill, professional expertise, and economic ability of cadres. This directly determines the growing role of economic training. The party views it as a most important factor of economic growth.

It is necessary without delay to embark on the cardinal restructuring of the economic education of agro-industrial cadres and to conduct it purposefully and consistently: Programs must be made more specific and the place and duration of the training of cadres of all levels must be defined. In general, the aim is to make productive use of the time that is left to provide people with valuable knowledge.

In organizing studies it is necessary to reach every enterprise, farm, section, team, link, and each individual worker. It is necessary to make studies specific and to establish a living link with practice, seeking to ensure not only that the students acquire knowledge but also that they are able to use it in production. In this context it is necessary to enhance the role of base farms, field classes, on-the-job training, and analyses of economic situations and business games.

In work with cadres during the period of restructuring of the entire management mechanism, special importance is attached to economic cadres. After all, the enhancement of the standard of economic work in the countryside and the swift mastering of economic accountability, the contract system, and other progressive forms of production organization largely depend on them. Their influence on molding economic thinking among all other workers is also great.

At the same time, due importance is not attached to economic cadres everywhere. As a result, the proportion of people with higher education is much lower among chief economic specialists than elsewhere. This applies in particular to chief accountants among whom specialists with higher education total only 38% and less than 20% in Pskov, Ivanovo, Kalinin, Kaluga, and Smolensk Oblasts. Therefore it is very important to work persistently everywhere to reinforce farms with economic cadres and to enhance their qualifications and the prestige of their job.

There is another aspect to the work with cadres which assumes a special importance in current conditions. On many farms the management apparatus is unjustifiably bloated and the cost of maintaining it is growing. On average in the country today there are 36 specialists per sovkhoz and 28 specialists per kolkhoz, and on individual farms there are as many as 100 specialists.

In connection with the farms' switch to self-financing it will be necessary to take a close look at whether such numbers of administrative and management personnel are always justified. In this context the work under way in the Ukraine to regulate the number of them deserves attention and support. The essence of this work is that the farms themselves determine the wage fund and the number of leading workers, specialists, and service personnel of kolkhozes and sovkhozes on the basis of scientifically substantiated normatives taking into account the farms' specialization and zonal characteristics of production. The deductions for maintaining the management apparatus are determined on the basis of output sales volumes and profitability as a proportion of gross income.

[First Edition inserts the following additional paragraph here: "Calculations show that this approach will enable the republic's farms to reduce the management apparatus by 67,000 people with a wage fund of R81 million. In the current year around 30,000 people have already been released and sent to work in teams and at livestock units."]

In order to master the cost-cutting mechanism in practice and introduce economic accountability principles in every labor collective, section, shop, team, and livestock unit, purposeful efforts to deepen economic work in general are needed.

The constant search for reserves and enhanced production efficiency assumes key importance in the period of rapid development of the economy. The success of the cause today depends entirely on cadres' ability to conduct management with economic competence and organize production on the basis of the widespread application of the achievements of science and progressive experience.

[First Edition has the following additional paragraph here: "Therefore the key task of party, soviet, and economic organs is to organize everywhere training of all cadres in concrete economics, efficient production organization, and application of intensive and resource-saving technologies. Proceeding from last year's results, it is necessary now to organize training in such a way as to ensure that every worker has a perfect knowledge of the work entrusted to him."]

In conclusion V.P. Nikonov dwelt on current tasks in crop farming, livestock raising, and the processing sphere. In order to considerably improve the food situation, a decisive step forward in the fulfillment of the plan targets must be taken. It is necessary to work energetically and with initiative and to enhance exactingness toward oneself and one's colleagues with a view to constantly enhancing the level of agro-industrial production, reinforcing its economy, and steadily increasing food resources.

A coreport was delivered by A.I. Iyevlev, USSR minister and first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosagroprom. He described the work of agro-industrial complex management organs in switching the complex' enterprises to the new management conditions. The measures aimed at overcoming administrative methods of management are creating conditions for all workers to display their initiative and creative potential. This makes it possible to bring enormous economic growth reserves into play and to impart the necessary acceleration to the development of production.

The widespread utilization of economic accountability relations based on full self-capitalization and self-financing is a reliable method of achieving the set aims. The mass introduction of these higher forms of economic accountability which has now begun in the country represents a key stage—and in many respects the decisive stage—of the entire restructuring of agro-industrial production.

The speaker made a detailed analysis of the economic situation which has taken shape in the sphere of agro-industrial production. The expenditure of material resources has sharply risen of late, but a due return has so far failed to materialize and there is practically no growth in output consonant with the investment. As a result, a complex financial situation has developed not just in agriculture but also in the processing sectors of the agro-industrial complex. It would not be correct to count on additional "injections" of capital. It is necessary above all to focus attention on the utilization of internal reserves. And there are quite a few of them in the agro-industrial complex.

In the last few years a big differentiation has arisen in the production level and economic indicators of farms and enterprises. Some farms have advanced by leaps and bounds in economic and social development and have a large income and a stable economy. But there are also some which operate at a loss. A substantial proportion of kolkhozes and sovkhozes may be profitable, but their profitability is insufficient for expanded reproduction in conditions of self-financing. The economic situation of food industry enterprises, especially in the sugar, oil and fat, and starch and treacle sectors, is uneven.

For this reason, the speaker noted, a considered and well thought-out approach is needed. The task of switching farms, enterprises, and organizations to full economic accountability and self-financing must be tackled on the basis of the comprehensive improvement of the entire management mechanism. It is necessary above all to elaborate specific and completely realistic proposals for improving the level of management and revenue at every farm and enterprise, relying here on the extensive introduction into production of the achievements of scientific and technical progress.

[First Edition has the following additional paragraph here: "The reserves for increasing revenue are considerable. In order to bring them into play, it is necessary to comprehensively and thoroughly analyze the standard of production organization in every sector, every team, and every workplace. The main aim here is to identify and block channels for production losses and unjustified production expenses. The preparatory work on loss-making farms must lead to a decisive breakthrough in their activities."]

Touching on the draft resolution on switching agro-industrial complex enterprises to full economic accountability and self-financing, the speaker dwelt on the provisions pertaining to the establishment of differentiated markups on purchasing prices and to various aspects of financing economic activity. It was emphasized at this point that the economic end results must be determined solely by the standard of work of leaders and specialists, by the standard of the creative activity of personnel. The coreport was then delivered by Academician A.A. Nikonov, president of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences [VASKHNIL] and deputy chairman of the USSR Gosagroprom. He dwelt on the scientific principles of the improvement of management and the economic management mechanism in the agro-industrial complex.

He drew attention to the special importance of the speediest solution of the food problem and creation of adequate stocks of high-quality food. To do this it is necessary to effect a real breakthrough in improving labor productivity and in the rate of improvement of the productivity of agro-industrial production. There are examples of this work in many primary labor collectives. The task is to accelerate the transfer of the agrarian economy to methods which will make for the fuller exploitation of the entire resource potential.

The creation of a reliable cost-cutting mechanism and the assimilation at all levels of forms of organization that rule out leveling and work without personal responsibility are of great importance in terms of the switch to self-capitalization and self-financing. Taking practice and historical experience as his basis, he singled out as one of the chief aspects of agro-industrial production organization the development of cooperative production, payment according to labor, and acceptance of a diversity of organizational forms. It is important to conduct a truly creative quest in these areas and create really effective conditions for the growth of agro-industrial production.

The new forms of agro-industrial integration—production and science-and-production systems, agro-industrial firms, combines, and associations—must play a very prominent part in radically improving work on widely disseminating the achievements of science and leading experience.

[First Edition adds the following paragraph: "Production or science-and-production systems, for example, make it possible to organize adoption in a totally new way. They bring together scientific collectives, the best farms, and laggard kolkhozes and sovkhozes. On the basis of the experience of leading workers and new techniques elaborated by scientists, they are tackling particular targeted tasks on improving the production of a particular type of output. The association exists on an entirely voluntary, contract basis. All the practical assistance a leading farm or scientific collective gives to a laggard kolkhoz or sovkhoz has to be paid for. And the amount payable depends directly on the end result—the amount of extra profit."]

The VASKHNIL president cited examples where farms' adoption of scientists' recommendations on problems of contract relations, the principles of full economic accountability, and other scientific developments has had a great impact on plant growing and livestock raising. At the same time, science is still failing to provide fully for the agro-industrial complex's vital needs.

Scientific recommendations on organizing an optimum model for agro-industrial production primary components were recently examined and sent out. The main emphasis was on the development of economic independence and economic accountability relations on kolkhozes and sovkhozes and the creation of favorable conditions for improving work efficiency.

Agrarian science has traveled a difficult path, the speaker said in conclusion. It faces major tasks today. Scientists are making every effort to fulfill them honorably.

The conference was addressed by V.I. Naumov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Gosagroprom and RSFSR minister; Yu.M. Khusainov, first deputy chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's Gosagroprom; V.A. Starodubtsev, chairman of the "Novomoskovskoye" Agro-Industrial Association in Tula Oblast; I.I. Lukinov, vice president of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences and director of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute; A.E. Kauls, chairman of the "Adazhi" agro-industrial firm in Rizhskiy Rayon, Latvian SSR; V.V. Shvets, chief economist at the Manshuk Mametova Sovkhoz in Tselinograd Oblast; M.M. Lomach, general director of the "Kuban" agro-industrial combine in Timashevskiy Rayon, Krasnodar Kray; S.N. Usmanov, director of the Central Asian Scientific Research Institute of Agricultural Economics; N.A. Rochev, director of the "Lesnoye" pedigree stock farm in Gatchinskiy Rayon, Leningrad Oblast; and V.M. Sergeyev, director of the "Krasnoyarskiy" Sovkhoz in Novosibirsk Oblast. [First Edition omits previous paragraph]

Summing up the conference, Ye.K. Ligachev noted that there had been a keen and able discussion of economic-organization problems connected with the future development of the agro-industrial complex. The discussion demonstrated that work on organizing the transfer of enterprises to economic accountability and self-financing has been delayed. Central economic departments, the USSR Gosagroprom, and VASKHNIL must speed up considerably their elaboration of the requisite normative base ensuring the switch to economic accountability and self-financing.

Local bodies also need to be more active and efficient. Their chief task is to train people for work in the new economic conditions. It is necessary to organize the training of leaders, specialists, and ordinary working people and their acquisition of economic knowledge, specific rather than general economic knowledge, related to the tasks involved in the organization of economically accountable and self-financing work. [The following (repetitious) sentence is not in the First Edition] It is necessary to organize the training of leaders, specialists, and ordinary working people and their acquisition of economic knowledge. A great deal of work has to be done to provide an economic analysis of the activity of each enterprise and reveal all the untapped reserves [First Edition version of this paragraph continues ...and determine priority areas for material-technical, financial, and labor resources. All this offers broad scope for the activity of primary party organizations and party committees which must take charge of this work].

The CPSU Central Committee secretary drew attention to the fact that the economy of developing socialism is entering a new stage of management in which the management of the national economy at all levels will be principally by economic methods. But this in no ways means that the economic management mechanism and the new technology will solve all the problems, as some people believe, and virtually automatically ensure the orderly progress [planomernyy khod] of social production.

The advantage of economic methods of running the economy may be considerable, but there are also many other highly effective [First Edition omits "highly effective"] ways of managing the economy. We are talking about the political approach to leadership. In particular, the selection and education of leader cadres, their training, the improvement of workers' and specialists' skills, political work with people, and the creation of the requisite working and everyday conditions for them. We are talking about socialist democratism, glasnost, people's real involvement in running production and social affairs, and the creation of an atmosphere of respect for people. All this is geared [First Edition has "must be geared"] to activating the human factor, revealing people's abilities and exploiting our system's potential. [First Edition adds the following sentence: And party organizations and their leading must concentrate on solving these tasks.] Unity of economic and political methods is esential to the success of party and state leadership of the national economy.

When tackling long-term tasks one must not lose sight of routine matters. In particular, ensuring a successful wintering period at livestock raising units and preparations for spring field and harvest work next year. Soviet and economic bodies, trade union and Komsomol organizations, and the news and propaganda media must get involved in this.

Local party and economic bodies must focus attention on the winter work of enterprises processing and storing agricultural products and the completion of plans for the construction and commissioning of housing, other social, cultural, and consumer facilities, and the entire nonproduction sphere in the countryside.

In conclusion Ye.K. Ligachev said:

Now that the party has a modern theoretical and political platform the main thing is the practical implementation of the policy of restructuring economic and sociopolitical structures, the implementation of national economic plans, and the socialist democratization of society. People will judge not by words, but by actual deeds the value of each of us, of our cadres and their ability to change things for the better.

It will take a long time to restructure and renew the forms and structures of society and reshape people's thinking.

There are people who can reject the old and the worthless, but throw in the towel when faced with having to create something new. The main thing is to create. A sudden burst of activity will achieve little. What is needed is a long period of steady, highly effective work.

Military

More on Strategic Rocket Forces, Artillery Day

Yazov on 'Danger' of Nuclear War

LD191513 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1403 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow, Nov 19 (TANJUG)—The Soviet defence minister, General Dmitriy Yazov, said today that "in a complex international situation there is still a danger of a nuclear war."

Speaking on the occasion of the Soviet Rocket Units' Day, General Yazov said that "reactionary imperialistic circles are ignoring the lessons of history and are striving for military superiority over the Soviet Union and the Warsaw treaty countries."

General Maksimov Address

LD192306 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1505 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Speech by Army General Yuriy Pavlovich Maksimov, commander-in-chief of the Strategic Rocket Forces, USSR deputy defense minister, and hero of the Soviet Union, on occasion of Strategic Rocket Forces and Artillery Day, 19 November; place not given—recorded]

[Text] Dear Comrades:

The Soviet people and the servicemen of the USSR Armed Forces are festively marking Strategic Rocket Forces and Artillery Day today. This year it is lit up by the celebration of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. All of us are under the profound impression of this glorious jubilee. It was a convincing demonstration of the orientation of the Land of the Soviets toward the future, of a sober realism in the evaluation of what has been achieved, of unvarnished truth, and of firm confidence that the revolutionary renewal is irreversible.

In light of the history of the Great October Socialist Revolution, a special place belongs to today's holiday. Strategic Rocket Forces and Artillery Day was born in the fire of the fierce engagements of the Great Patriotic War, the most severe ordeal that befell our people. On this day, 19 November 1942, a mighty cannonade of many thousands of guns, mortars, and rocket launchers announced to the entire world the start of the rout of the fascist forces near Stalingrad, with the inevitable collapse of Hitlerite Germany.

The valor of Soviet gunners was marked not only with many awards but also by instituting their special holiday: Artillery Day. From 1964 onward, 20 years later, this holiday has been celebrated as Strategic Rocket Forces and Artillery Day. Reflected in the change of its name were those radical revolutionary transformations in the means of armed struggle that resulted in creation of a new service: the Strategic Rocket Forces.

On this day, Soviet people pay tribute to the combat courage of front line soldiers and to the military work of the current generation of gunners and rocketmen. They also expressed profound gratitude for the selfless work of workers, engineers, and technicians, and for the creative genius of scientists and designers who created rocket and artillery equipment.

Permit me, dear comrades, to greet everyone warmly and cordially on the occasion of this splendid patriotic holiday, Strategic Rocket Forces and Artillery Day.

We are celebrating this holiday in an atmosphere of a high political and labor upsurge in the country. Soviet people are vigorously fighting for implementation of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress. The main efforts have been concentrated on tackling tasks of speeding up the country's social and economic development, of intensifying the economy on the basis of scientific and technical progress, and of improving the system of social relationships. In a word, effective and revolutionary restructuring is in progress in all spheres of life of our society.

Soviet people unanimously approve and support the innovative approach of its well-tried leader, the Leninist party, toward resolving vital present-day problems. They are working selflessly on strengthening the economic and defense power of the socialist state.

Our country must tackle huge constructive tasks under complex conditions. Despite the appearance in international relations of favorable tendencies, which emerged thanks to the firm and consistent course of the Soviet state's foreign policy, the situation in the world remains complicated, contradictory and, in a number of cases, also explosive through the fault of the most aggressive militarist forces of imperialism. The threat of nuclear war has not been removed. Disregarding the lessons of history, reactionary imperialist circles are continuing to strive for military superiority. Seeking to upset the existing military-strategic parity, the United States and NATO are building up their armaments. They are not hiding their intention to take arms out into space and are hastening to lend an irreversible nature to implementation of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative.

Under these conditions, following Lenin's behest that we must accompany our steps toward peace with fully maintaining all our military preparedness, the Communist Party and the Soviet Government is devoting great and unremitting attention to strengthening the country's defense capability.

In his report at the jubilee festive meeting in the Kremlin, Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed that as long as the danger of war remains, as social revenge-seeking remains at the core of the West's strategy and militarist programs, we will continue to do everything necessary to maintain our defense power at a level that rules out the military superiority of imperialism over socialism.

Great and responsible tasks in safeguarding the security of our homeland and of the countries of the socialist community are assigned to the Soviet Armed Forces. They are fulfilling these task with honor. Standing guard over the peaceful work of the Soviet people, in the single formation of Soviet servicemen, rocketmen and gunners are serving vigilantly and reliably. The Strategic Rocket Forces are an integral part of the Armed Forces. They are fitted out with the latest military equipment and possess enormous power. The Strategic Rocket Forces are in constant combat readiness. During peacetime, they carry out a task of special state importance and are continuously on alert duty. On the order of the homeland, the rocketmen are ready any minute to strike a crippling blow of retribution against any aggressor. However, the main mission of the Strategic Rocket Forces, just as of the Soviet Armed Forces as a whole, is to prevent war, to be one of the reliable guarantors of peace on earth.

The Strategic Rocket Forces and Artillery of the Land Forces possess immense fire power and high mobile potential. They are equipped with rocket and artillery systems that fully meet the requirements of present-day battle. They are noted for their high mobility, range, and effectiveness of fire.

But the strength of our Armed Forces lies not only in weapons. Soviet servicemen are the basis of their combat power and high combat readiness. Raised by the Communist Party, they are wholeheartedly devoted to it and the Soviet people. True to the heroic traditions of their and fathers and forefathers, they are carrying out their military duty with honor.

Rocketmen and gunners unanimously approve and support the Communist Party's innovative course. Restructuring has entered our army reality in a masterful way and has become an integral part of it. Checking their work with the demands of the 27th CPSU Congress, commanders, political agencies, party, and Komsomol organizations are developing the initiative and creative power of their personnel in every way. They are mobilizing servicemen into tackling tasks regarding the further raising of combat readiness, as well as strengthening good organization and military discipline. Mastering complicated fighting equipment is proceeding in a planned and efficient way. Educational work is being improved.

At the same time, the struggle for eliminating existing shortcomings in various spheres of the life and activities of the forces, derelictions of duty and laxities [poslableniya] in the combat training of personnel is being waged vigorosly, aggressively, and uncompromisingly.

The results of the school year are convincing evidence that the rocketmen and gunners are celebrating their professional holiday with good indicators. The combat proficiency of personnel has increased.

All combat training rocket launches and artillery firing sessions were conducted successfully this year. The absolute majority of military collectives fulfilled their socialist pledges. It is pleasant to note that the servicemen of the rocket unit under Lieutenant Colonel Ulyanov, the initiator of socialist competition in the Strategic Rocket Forces, successfully carried out the tasks set and their pledges. Every servicemen here has become a qualified specialist. Many of them have mastered associated trades. Over 5% of combat crews are headed by experts in martial affairs. There are quite a few such units in the Strategic Rocket Forces. The units and subunits that are commanded by officers Mikhaylov, Gulko, (?Felchukov), Sereda, Nesalenyy, Polshinskiy, Chukhnov, Garbelev, Gavrilenko, and many, many others celebrated the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution with high indices.

The party organizations are a cementing force, a true vanguard of military collectives. They act as the main mobilizing force in achieving high final results in combat training and service. The party organizations and all Communists are now conducting specific practical work in preparation for the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

The Komsomol members are the Communists' reliable combat assistants. These Komsomol members make up the majority of personnel. The concerted, purposeful work of commanders, political workers, party, and Komsomol organizations serves as a solid basis for the successes of front-ranking units and subunits.

Rocketmen and gunners do not content themselves with what has been achieved. Summing up the results of the current year, we evaluate these results and the level of combat proficiency and discipline in a self-critical way and we are vigorously drawing on additional potential in order to take a new step in our combat improvement in the 1988 school year, the year of the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Armed Forces.

For us, the forthcoming jubilee of the Soviet Army and Navy will be both a great holiday and a strict examination of military skill, of ideological and political maturity of the armed defenders of socialism, and of their fidelity to glorious combat traditions and to their patriotic and military duty. High state awards shine on the combat banners of many rocket and artillery units; combat orders for courage and heroism shown by these units in the battles of the Great Patriotic War. The rocket and artillery servicemen hold sacred the military valor of the soldiers who served in their regiments and are persistently mastering the science of winning victory, which has been forged in the battles for the homeland.

The valorous Armed Forces of the Land of the Soviets have covered a long and truly heroic path, reliably guarding the gains of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Soviet servicemen have more than once had to enter a fierce fight with enemies of the new system, but they have always come out victorious.

Closely rallied around the Leninist Communist Party, Soviet servicemen are today vigilantly standing guard over the great gains of socialism. Rocketmen and gunners are always ready to carry out their sacred duty of defending the homeland in the common combat formation.

Permit me to greet you once again, dear comrades, on the occasion of your holiday, Strategic Rocket Forces and Artillery Day, to wish you robust health, well-being and happiness, and new exploits in your work for the good of our great socialist homeland.

Rodin on Combat Readiness

LD191607 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0910 GMT 19 Nov 87

[From the "Time, Events, People" program conducted by Vladimir Konyukhov]

[Excerpts] [Konyukhov] It is particularly pleasant for me today to present to you Colonel General Rodin, member of the Military Council, head of the Political Directorate of Strategic Missile Troops. Viktor Semenovich, what are the special features of the present Missile and Artillery Troops Day?

[Rodin] [passage omitted] Missile and artillery troops are meeting it in a worthy fashion, filled with the striving to fulfill historic decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and reliably ensure the security of our great homeland.

[Konyukhov] Comrade general, while security has been mentioned, a broader concept for military people is combat readiness. How is this determined?

[Rodin] Well, as is known, for nuclear missile weapons no borders exist and the flight time to targets is calculated in minutes. Therefore, to ensure that an aggressor is not tempted to seek a moment for a surprise attack, missile troops are always on the alert. They are constantly and vigilantly on combat duty; they are on a constant high level of combat readiness to immediately inflict a retaliatory strike against the enemy if he risks using nuclear missiles against our country and the countries of the socialist community. So, combat readiness is an intense regime of waiting to put into operation precisely and unfailingly the terrible weapons of retribution.

[Konyukhov] You have said that the missile troops are always on the alert. Does much depend on the soldier here?

[Rodin] Undoubtedly. At any event, no small amount. Of course, the state of combat readiness is determined to a great extent by the quality and combat possibilities of the weapons and military equipment. But people are the most important element. Effectiveness of the use of the weapons depends on their skill, moral and psychological training, and combat qualities. The Soviet state is undertaking all possible measures to ensure that the parity achieved in the quantity and quality of means of waging armed struggle should not be violated while following the course of lowering its threshold. But we have always outstripped, and we shall always outstrip, any probable enemy in the ideological straunchness of the Soviet soldier and officer, in the level of their responsibility for implementation of combat tasks. That is, we must be stronger and more powerful on those aspects which depend directly on the personnel. We have no other way. We are obliged to accompany our efforts to maintain the balance with raising the military skills, staunchness, responsibility, discipline, and organization of military people. The patriotism of the armed defender of the socialist fatherland, his political maturity, his courage and selflessness, his readiness for self-sacrifice in carrying out his duties—this is our sacred military tradition and a most important guarantee of the security of out homeland. The missile and artillery troops follow this tradition unwaveringly.

[Konyukhov] Viktor Semenovich, how is this being confirmed today?

[Rodin] [passage omitted] Of course, the levels that have been achieved in improving combat skills do not give us the right to complacency. The important thing is not to allow an overestimation of what has been achieved, to act in the spirit of restructuring in order to fulfill demands of the party in raising combat readiness and on this basis to ensure a worthy welcome for the 70th anniversary of the Soviet armed forces and the 19th all-union conference of the CPSU. [passage omitted]

Jubilee of Missile Launch Noted

OW191603 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 19 Nov 87

[Video commentary by political observer Aleksandr Tikhomirov, on the occasion of Missile Troops and Artillery Day; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Hello, comrades. I want to show you some film footage shot in a grassland region, which can deservedly be called historic, because 40 years ago it became the first state missile testing ground.

[Begin recording] [Tikhomirov] This is exactly where the first Soviet ballistic missile was launched in October 1947. An exact replica of this missile now stands here on a pedestal. [Video shows the monument and a plaque with a list of names] On this board are the names of the combat detachment. Not all of them are gathered here today for the jubilee of the first launch: Marshal Yakovlev, Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov, who was the Armament Minister at the time, and many others are not with us any more. [Video shows group photos of the research team, including D.F. Ustinov and S.P. Korolev, cutting back to shots of the present meeting] Did they, including Sergey Pavlovich Korolev, who is in the center of the photo, understand then that it was a moment of salvation? Did they understand that the delivery vehicles that were to follow, newer generations mated with atomic and later thermonuclear charge, would make any plans to attack the USSR an absurdity?

From our present perspective, we can, of course, give a genuine and complete assessment of the importance of that day. As many now recall, they cried then, yet they were people who were still wearing their frontline greatcoats. [Video shows an unidentified colonel general speaking into a microphone, then cuts to shots of veterans in conversation] Veterans, including prominent scientists and design engineers, came here today together with the regular missile troops to mark the 40th anniversary of the first launch. I nearly said famous veterans, but caught myself. Fame and glory did not follow these people for well-known reasons. However, one can probably easily guess that the power of a missile is equivalent to the power of the intellect and talent put into it. [Video shows a group of people in civilian and military dress posing for a photo in front of the missile monument, then cuts to show Ya.I. Tregub, who is not further identified]

[Ya.I. Tregub] We had an order to make these, and the following missiles, and we made them. We used only our materials. We were not allowed to take a single bolt nor a single piece of wire from over there.

[Unidentified speaker] By the way, there was a disagreement...

[Tregub, interrupting] There was a disagreement when we tried to bring a small amount of insulation from Germany—no way. We had a railway car standing over there. If you did not agree, they would explain it to you in that car. [Laughter] We used only our own materials. The widespread trend now, when things are not working out, is to quickly spend millions, and do things somewhere—I do not approve of it. [Video zooms back to include several men, among them Academicians V.I. Kuznetsov and V.P. Mishin, shown standing on Tregub's right]

[Kuznetsov] They forced us to use Soviet machine tools...

[Tregub, interrupting] We do not approve of this, not only because it means money, but it destroys the interest of young specialists. We knew we had to do it, so you did it.

[Mishin] If something was needed, we made it.

[Tregub] Now the top management says: We do not have it, so we shall buy it.

[Mishin] They do that in the Academy of Sciences, in particular. They love to buy foreign-made instruments, when at the same time...

[Tregub, interrupting] This has to be stopped now to some extent. We can make items ourselves when they are needed.

[Kuznetsov] We can make them, better, by the way. [end recording]

You must agree with me that now is exactly the time when this is needed. Due to circumstances, my interlocutors have been at the frontline of our country's scientific achievements all their lives. This is why they know and see its potential. They also know the shortcomings and distortions in individual branches of industry as well. Take, for example, the reliability of the missiles' cryogenic system. Thank God it is not on the same level of reliability as that of our refrigerators! But why over all these years have not our refrigerators even approached the level of reliability of our missiles? One can say that our defense equipment is on a level with the best world standards. This is what permits world military and strategic parity to be ensured. But what about machine tools, tractors, and television sets? Have we not enough power and skill to bring them to the level of the world's best standards? Or have the workers' hands changed? Or have the engineers diplomas changed? [Video shows launch of the R-1 missile]

This is the kind of conversation about restructuring that occurred on the missile jubilee, the 40th anniversary of this launch of the R-1, now called "number one" [edinichka] in the first generation of our missiles.

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names which are rendered phonetically or transliterated by FBIS/JPRS are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in 8 volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Africa (Sub-Sahara), Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically. Current JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcovers or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. DOD consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.) For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (703) 527-2368, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.